

# BACONIANA

Founded 1886

April 1957

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial- - - - -	1
Obituary - - - - -	7
A Pioneer, V - - - - -	8
Francis Bacon's Milieu - - - - -	15
Bacon's Vindication - - - - -	19
The Masks of an earlier Lord Keeper - - - - -	26
Towards a more correct Biography of Francis Bacon -	27
Francis Bacon as Essayist and Orator - - - - -	32
Shake-speare's Sonnets and "Mr. W. H." - - - - -	40
George Sandys - - - - -	44
Correspondence - - - - -	46

Published periodically

LONDON:

Published by THE FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY INCORPORATED at  
 Canonbury Tower, Islington, London, N.1, and printed by the  
 Rydal Press, Keighley.



# BACONIANA

Founded 1886

November, 1957

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial - - - - -	49
Some Vanity of Mine Art - - - - -	59
A Pioneer, VI - - - - -	64
Francis Bacon and the Electronic Computer - - - - -	73
Truth Brought to Light - - - - -	75
Dr. William Harvey and Francis Bacon - - - - -	77
Did Christopher Marlowe write Shakespeare - - - - -	79
That Masonic Lost Word - - - - -	86
Bacon's Instruments as aids to the sense of light - - - - -	92
Shakespeare's Sonnets and "Mr. W. H." - - - - -	104
Correspondence - - - - -	110

Published periodically

LONDON:

Published by THE FRANCIS BACON SOCIETY INCORPORATED at  
Canonbury Tower, Islington, London, N.1, and printed by the  
Rydal Press, Keighley.

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2025



Statue of Francis Bacon at Gray's Inn





Statue of Francis Bacon in South Square, Gray's Inn,  
before the "Blitz"

# BACONIANA

---

VOL. XLI (72nd Year)

No. 156

APRIL, 1957

---

*It should be clearly understood that BACONIANA is a medium for the discussion of subjects connected with the Objects of the Society, but the Council does not necessarily endorse opinions expressed by contributors or correspondents.*

---

## EDITORIAL

*"The Blessing of Judah and Issachar will never meet; that the same People or Nation should be both The Lion's whelp and the Ass between burdens. Neither will it be that a People overlaid with Taxes should ever become Valiant . . . . ."*

(The True Greatness of Kingdoms).

Readers must forgive us for introducing so depressing a topic as the Inland Revenue at this time of year. But the episode in Bacon's early life to which we are about to refer sprang from the very depths of his character, which it is our firm intention to vindicate. The true facts were so skilfully misrepresented by Lord Macaulay (who, as Spedding observes, will be read as literature if not as history for many years to come) that they will bear repeating here. Rightly has Sir Winston Churchill dubbed Macaulay "The Prince of literary rogues"!

Among the constitutional questions which occupied the prophetic mind of Bacon for many years of his life were the following:— a more enlightened attitude towards taxation, and a more dignified treatment of the Commons by the Crown. From the day he entered the House as member for Malcombe in 1584, until the last chapter of the *New Atlantis* was begun (but never ended), he strove constantly for a better understanding between subject and sovereign. He seems to have held the advanced idea that taxation, in an ideal state, should be voluntary and whole-hearted. It was in this mood that, as the member for Middlesex and Liverpool in 1593, he deliberately sacrificed his own personal favour with the Queen for the good of the realm. Clearly his ideas of Parliamentary procedure were so far ahead of his time as to appear absurd to the Queen and the Cecils, and unintelligible to King James and his favourites. He even held the eccentric view that it was a *privilege* of the subject to finance the Crown! He also expected a certain delicacy to be observed in the way a Parliament



was summoned, even if the only object was to replenish the Treasury! This sense of propriety Robert Cecil evidently failed to satisfy. For in Bacon's eyes the proceedings of the Court in 1593, in presenting one of the earliest of our "defence budgets", seemed to savour too strongly of coercion.

It was a constitutional point in the mind of Bacon that a mutual obligation existed between the sovereign and the people—the one establishing laws by advice and consent of Parliament, the other supplying the financial needs of the State. Privilege and prerogative were interdependent things: and therefore to call a Parliament solely and brazenly for supplying the necessities of the Crown, without including on the agenda other matters of State such as legislation, etc., involved a breach of good taste which would eventually defeat its own object. He seems to have believed that the Commons in 1593, under threat of impending hostilities with Spain, would be more generous if left to grant the necessary subsidies of its own free will. But the Queen and her Ministers thought otherwise, and an attempt was made not only to treble existing taxation, but to take away from the Commons its ancient privilege of giving. Only a Bacon could have foreseen that a new age was approaching when to take away from the Commons its power to give, would be to take away its devotion, if not its loyalty.

\* \* \* \*

It is impossible to doubt that the subtle Robert Cecil and the brutally efficient Edward Coke were more fitting tools for a despotic Queen. Probably she understood their defects as well as their merits and deliberately used them in the same way (Bacon would have said) as Jupiter used the Cyclops! But for once the more crafty and unscrupulous Cecil was to receive a needed parliamentary rebuff at the hands of the visionary Bacon.

During the first twenty-six years of Elizabeth's reign ordinary taxation was doubled, and during the last eight years it was to be quadrupled.<sup>1</sup> Although the reasons for this were fairly obvious to all, certainly to Bacon, this continued increase had become an anxiety to the Commons. There was not in those days a parliamentary opposition whose main object was to embarrass the party in power, and the suggestion that one had already grown up under the leadership of Essex has, according to Spedding, no foundation at all, and is quite incredible to anyone acquainted with the period. In those days there was nothing to be gained, and much to be lost, by needlessly antagonising the Queen's Ministers. And when the Court and the Lords, taking advantage of patriotic feelings, tried to encroach on the privileges of the Commons, Bacon found himself acting alone as parliamentary "opposition". The first subtle encroachment had already been achieved by the Court without so much as a vote. For when the Speaker had proffered the usual petition for liberty of speech, the Lord Keeper was instructed to answer "That liberty of speech

---

<sup>1</sup>Spedding: *Francis Bacon and his Times*.



was granted in respect of Aye and No; but *not* that everyone should speak what he listed". This in reality denied liberty of speech and allowed only liberty of vote; an advantage which the Crown was soon to follow up in ugly fashion by committing Peter Wentworth (and other petitioners on the law of succession), to the Tower and the Fleet. Feelings in Parliament were therefore a mixture of patriotic loyalty and fear of the despotism; the atmosphere was ominous and hardly encouraging to Bacon to speak his mind alone.

Cecil's next move, evidently with Royal sanction, was to introduce a procedure to the Commons for discussing money bills in conference with the Lords. Bacon was on his guard immediately. Once allow the Lords a precedent in its claim to confer with the Commons on a question of supply, and the unique power of the Commons would be gone. Bacon had been the first to support the treble Subsidy, though he questioned the time factor in collection, but now he rose again, with great effect, as soon as Cecil sat down. As the report tells us, Mr. Francis Bacon . . . . .

" . . . . . yielded to the Subsidy, but disliked that this House should join with the Upper House in the granting of it. For the custom and privilege of this House hath always been first to make offer of the Subsidy from hence into the Upper House. And reason it is that we should stand upon our privilege".<sup>1</sup>

His main objection to the Bill was thus seen to be one of form. Cecil had counted on the heat of patriotism against Spain to establish an unwarranted precedent. Coke, who might have objected, was in the running for lucrative appointments, and would obviously be afraid of offending the Queen. Raleigh could be counted upon to refrain from any activity which might hinder the Government's measures against Spain. The stage was cleverly set, and Cecil's gambit—a pre-arranged conference with the Lords (whose minds had already been made up for them)—very nearly succeeded. So confident did the Queen's Council feel, that the Lords were inspired to warn the Commons beforehand through the Lord Treasurer that, when the expected "conference" took place, they would consent to nothing less than a treble Subsidy collected in half the usual period.<sup>2</sup> But the unexpected now happened; Bacon stood firm; the conference was tactfully declined, and although the money bill went through with some amendments, the Commons retained, and still retains to this day, its ancient privilege. Bacon, to whom the Royal displeasure was conveyed publicly, did not abandon his position. He was sorry to have offended but, in spite of considerable pressure, neither changed nor withdrew his opinion. Macaulay, in his scintillating but infamous libel of a greater man than himself, seems to have twisted the facts.

We have drawn attention to this rather obscure piece of English Parliamentary history as part of our general endeavour to vindicate

<sup>1</sup> d'Ewes.

<sup>2</sup> Hargrave MS., quoted by D'Ewes and Spedding.

Lord Bacon's character. For it is not only the final sacrifice, but the whole life which has to be reviewed in the light of a more impartial historical judgment. Bacon, if in many respects a visionary, was nothing if not practical; he was even prepared quite early in his career to stake his political future on the truth of his vision. He was not so much concerned with the finances of overtaxation, as with the psychological depression of a whole nation. The same question, we believe, arises to-day. Two very different issues are still at stake—solvency and survival; not personal survival but survival of what an Irish writer has called the "National being".

The Great Power which has for so long been known to the world as Britain did not arrive at its zenith simply by a series of aggressive conquests. It had been fed and enriched by a free and vigorous intellectual life, uninterrupted by the ravages of civil war, revolution or overtaxation, for more than two centuries; and it was in a position to bestow much in the way of benevolent democracy, of which the world stood in need. But that day is over, and if external circumstances are a measure of the inner life, our inward flame is burning low. In one sense this can be attributed to an increasing burden of taxation and regimentation, which now leaves little room for higher enterprise or initiative. To the accountant, the actuary, or the politician, the question of taxation may be simply a budgetary one. To the philosopher or statesman a greater issue is at stake—the survival or gradual extermination of a national spirit. The Welfare State can accomplish much on the material plane . . . at a price. If the price of over-expenditure and overtaxation was simply a matter of figures, no immediate deterioration would ensue. But if the price must also include its "pound of flesh" in the form of human degeneration—the shelving of personal responsibilities and the smothering of individual enterprise—then, in Bacon's eyes, it would be too high, and no such people could ever *become valiant*.

After all the modern welfare state is not a "New Atlantis". It has to depend for its revenue, not on the joyous and spontaneous support which a voluntary community or brotherhood receives from its members, but upon an ever-increasing burden of compulsory taxation. Thus do we swing in a barren circle; and it becomes more profitable "to offset income tax" than to increase income; to "work to rule" rather than to increase output. Surely taxation ought not to rise to a figure that can cause this deterioration. Few of us are yet altruistic enough to labour for no remuneration but the love of our work. The workman is worthy of his hire.

The Baconian ideal in respect of property can be summed up in a phrase of de Selincourt—"devoted possession". The goal of one huge heap of money owned by the state and the punishment of anyone convicted of a bank balance, was not in his philosophy; for no one can give devotedly what is not theirs to give. Possessions are a test of generosity—even the widow possessed her mite. The time may come when money can be dispensed with, but it is not yet. Money in Bacon's day, as in our own, was the legitimate means of developing trade,



stimulating enterprise, and fostering activity.....Money was like muck, "best when it is spread out".\*

With the ideal that all wealth should be used in the service of the State, few would disagree, and certainly not Francis Bacon. But the whole trend of his fiscal policy was to keep money in free circulation, so that all men might have the satisfaction of earning it, and the joy of using it devotedly.

"Riches are for the spending, and the spending for Honour and good actions; therefore extraordinary expense must be limited by the worth of the occasion. For *voluntary undoing* may be as well for a man's Country as for the Kingdom of Heaven. But ordinary expense ought to be limited by a man's estate. . . . ."

*Essay Of Expense.*

"Voluntary undoing. . . . for a man's Country" may seem an odd phrase to the tax collector; but it is one of those touches which are the charm of Bacon. How different it is from the regimentation and compulsory taxation from which there is no escape to-day. The modern social reformer does not see, what de Selincourt so aptly pointed out, that in taking away our possessions he is also taking away our devotion. Or to use Bacon's words in 1593, he is taking away our privilege "*to make offer from hence unto the Upper House*".

\* \* \* \*

We gave our readers notice in November that we hoped, in a series of articles by different people, to vindicate Lord Bacon's character; and by vindication we do not mean acknowledging faults which have not been proved and finding excuses for them, but a rebuttal of the various charges that have been brought against him. *The Pioneer* series of articles is helping to dispel the mist of ill-informed obscurantism that has hidden the true purpose of the Shakespeare plays. But one of the most stimulating vindications of Bacon as a man was written for *Baconiana* by the late H. Kendra Baker. It was re-printed in pamphlet form and was evidently popular, since no stock has been left. Spedding himself realised that all his monumental labours would never quite undo the damage done by Macaulay's sporting mixture of the highest praise and the most abject blame! It is the compactness and brilliance of his famous essay, libellous though it is, which leads people to refer to it rather than to the bulky fourteen volumes of Spedding. We trust that the reproduction of Kendra Baker's well-documented article will assist in reassuring our readers as to the integrity of Francis Bacon's public life.

\* \* \* \*

Many readers will have followed with interest the progress of Mr. R. L. Eagle in the "64,000 Question" contest on Independent Television last Autumn. Mr. Eagle had challenged, with "Shakespeare" as his subject, and we were very sorry to witness his misfortune in falling at the "last fence". Up to that point he had answered all the questions, some of them quite abstruse ones, without any hesita-



tion, and we could not help feeling that, on the last occasion, the five parts to the question were worded in a very confusing way, and that a misunderstanding as to what was meant in one of them may well have prevented Mr. Eagle from remembering a quotation from one of Shakespeare's Sonnets. It must be a great deal easier for the viewer, sitting in an armchair, to answer some of these questions, than it is to the challenger with a substantial prize at stake. A subsequent challenger confined her subject to the Shakespeare plays, evidently not including the poems or sonnets. She acquitted herself very well, and was sporting enough to go on when like Mr. Eagle she might have retired with a worth-while prize. She too fell at the last fence over a question regarding a well-known line in *Macbeth*. This kind of contest is one of the better ideas of I.T.V. The spectacle of reward for skill will always be popular with the public, and will at the same time present new media for education in intellectual worlds hitherto disregarded in public entertainment.

\* \* \* \*

One of the most exciting contemporary happenings from a Baconian point of view for some time, was briefly described by the Press last November. We refer to the adaptation of the Masque of the Prince of Purpoole which is alluded to in the current instalment of the late Parker Woodward's *Towards a More Correct Biography of Francis Bacon*. The performance was staged before our gracious Queen Elizabeth II and other members of the Royal family, on November 13th, at Gray's Inn Hall. It is encouraging to think that the Benchers are keeping up the tradition of holding occasional Masques, a practice which dates from Bacon's days. The Prince of Purpoole was originally described in Nichol's *Progresses of Elizabeth*, and its authorship has been ascribed to Bacon by no less an authority than James Spedding. It was, therefore, a little disappointing to find that Francis Bacon's name remained very much in the background at these proceedings, but we are happy to say that Mr. W. G. C. Gundry, of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law, hopes to contribute an article on the subject in our next number.

## OBITUARY

It is with deep regret that we have to announce to our readers the passing away of one of our Vice-Presidents in the person of Miss Constance Mary Pott, R.E., Assistant Professor at the Royal College of Art, South Kensington, London, in the 95th year of her age, which she just failed to complete by four days. Miss Pott was, in fact, born on the same date as Francis Bacon, *viz.* 22nd January.

Quite apart from her own personal charm, she is always to be remembered as the eldest daughter of Mrs. Henry Pott, the original founder and mainspring of our Society.

Having been brought up in the midst of a Baconian atmosphere it was only natural that she should have been imbued from early days with similar ideas. But her chief interest as a young woman was focussed in the world of art, which she studied at the Royal College of Art, under the guidance of Sir Frank Short, P.P., R.E., R.A., Professor and Director of the College.

Miss Pott's chief interests in art were etching and engraving in which she became very proficient and many specimens of her work were hung in the Royal Academy's annual Exhibitions. Miss Pott was Assistant Professor to Sir Frank Short and received her Doctorate. She designed and engraved, amongst much else, book plates of great originality and artistic merit and the present writer possesses one presented to him by her sixty years ago. Specimens of the plate designed by this lady for her mother may be seen in many of the books belonging to the Bacon Society.

In the passing of Miss Pott we lose one of the last remaining links uniting the Society with its great foundress.

*Requiescat in pace.*

L.B.

Mr. T. Wright has contributed the following:—

With the passing of Miss Pott, The Francis Bacon Society and the great cause for which it stands have lost a champion. Such a role was not suggested by her diminutive figure and aging years, and it would not have been apparent to those who did not know her. But, in the difficult years following the War and the controversies affecting the management of the Society, she ever strove to secure the maintenance of those cherished traditions which had stemmed from her mother, the founder; and, with staunch loyalty, stoutly resisted any attempt to depart therefrom. As a watchdog, she steadfastly safeguarded her mother's books and papers, thereby securing them against possible loss or destruction. My particular personal memory is of the readiness with which she extended a helping hand to a newcomer in search of the truth; for which I am ever grateful.

# A PIONEER V.

By M.P.

## "Philosophy Itself"

It is questionable whether more than a tithe of the real meaning, scope and purpose of Lord Bacon's great effort for civilization has yet been understood. King James I, a man of considerable erudition, and others as well informed as Spedding have confessed themselves baffled. Spedding seems to have been shy of approaching the kernel of the matter. Of Bacon's Instauration he writes as follows . . . . .

"We no longer look for any great treasure.... His peculiar system of philosophy—that is to say the peculiar method of investigation, the "organum", the "formula", the "clavis", the "ars ipsa interpretandi naturam", the "filum Labyrinthi", or by whichever of its many names we choose to call that artificial process by which alone he believed that man could attain a knowledge of the laws and a command over the powers of nature—of this philosophy we can make nothing. *If we have not tried it is because we feel confident that it would not answer*".

Delia Bacon could not dismiss this problem with the same complacency. In the words quoted above Spedding "gets out", but Lord Bacon's admonitions admit of no compromise . . . . .

"The labour we lose by not succeeding is nothing to the chances we lose by not trying. In the one we sacrifice a little human labour, in the other we hazard a mighty good".

(*Novum Organum*, Book I/114.)

"Whosoever would come to an understanding of this our work . . . . will not try to do so cursorily while attending to other business, but will . . . . himself attempt the course which we prescribe . . . . ."

(*Novum Organum*. Preface)

These are strongly worded expressions and, taken in their context, they suggest that Bacon's "Ars ipsa interpretandi naturam" may have been intended to cover more subjects than physical science alone.

However it must be remembered that Bacon's own utterances concerning what precisely was to be "tried" are extremely guarded. His exhortations to "try" are as much in earnest as his emphasis on the policy and morality of "secrecy", "secret and reserved writings", and "oral traditions". We must therefore regard him as unable or unwilling to be more explicit. Not everything could be made plain to everybody at once; it was better that men should be *enlightened by degrees*—that we should "*proceed by line and level*". In one of his most intimate writings, "The interpretation of Nature, XII sentences"\* this idea is well expressed. A translation of it appeared in Basil Montague's edition, accessible to Delia Bacon, but not unfortunately in Spedding which in any case came too late for her. Bacon is here

---

\*First printed posthumously by Gruter in 1653.



apostrophising his "sons" on the question of teaching through the medium of Art . . . . .

"But which (thou wilt say) is that legitimate mode of delivery? Dismiss all art and circumstances and exhibit the matter naked to us that we may use our own judgement. Would that you were in a condition, dearest son, to admit of this being done! . . . . . A new method must be entered upon by which we may glide into minds most obstructed . . . . . so that knowledge thus delivered (like a plant full of life's freshness) may be spread daily and grow to maturity . . . . . And whether I shall have accomplished all this or not, I appeal to future time."

Unlike Spedding, Delia found it impossible to believe that the great advocate of the experimental method had never applied it to those greater and nobler questions affecting the common weal such as statecraft, leadership, government, justice and a practical philosophy of life. Where, she asks, are the evidences of this "oblique" approach to men's minds, concerning which Bacon distinctly says that he is not "a vain promiser?" Where are those "examples" in which Bacon said that this new experimental method would be applied in "Certain subjects of the noblest kind?" Where are those "tables of invention for Anger, Fear and Shame?" Where is the "filthiness of particulars" for which Bacon apologises on the grounds that "valuable light may come from mean and sordid instances"? Where indeed is that promised **FOURTH PART** of the great instauration, which is generally supposed to be missing? These are legitimate questions and Delia's hypothesis certainly deserves a hearing; even Carlyle admitted that.

\* \* \* \*

To-day we would be inclined to answer that this elusive **FOURTH PART**—this "ladder of the mind"\*—has been growing ever since the first Shakespeare folio was given to the world; that it refers to all means of enlightenment by imaginative art, and that it would nowadays include the novel, the stage, the cinema, the television and even ceremonial. With many people whose daily life is restricted, it is only by entering the imaginative world of fiction (which Bacon called "feigned History") that experience can be extended. The reading of even one book can change a person. Whatever Bacon's original plan may have been, there is only one contemporary work which can be regarded as supplying his promised "examples", and that is the 1623 Shakespeare folio, with all its studious and thoughtful "quarto" revisions and its ten completely new plays. Gervinus, one of the greatest of Shakespearean commentators goes so far as to suggest this, though without pursuing the question of authorship.

Certainly a high degree of reticence concerning any claims to admit more light to the human mind, was a *sine qua non*. It was no part of Tudor despotism to educate the masses, and even in King James' reign no one could easily forget the dark shadow of the Tower and the depressing sight of human heads impaled on spikes. Great souls were

---

\*Bacon's own definition was "Scala Intellectus".

indeed beginning to project on the mental plane, but outwardly all heads must bow in submission to King and favourite. Thought alone was free.

It was obviously impossible to get out a scheme for general enlightenment without at once coming into collision with the doctrine of arbitrary power and privilege. Whoever dared handle these forbidden subjects must, to use Bacon's own phrase, "pray in aid of similes". But perhaps Delia's sublime view of the real purpose behind the Great Instauration is best expressed in her own words. . . . .

"Considering who the author of it is, and that it is, on the face of it . . . a new method of obtaining axioms of practice from history in general, and not a specific method of obtaining them from that particular department of history from which the instances are taken;\* and considering that the author was deeply aware of the whole sweep of its implications, and that he has taken pains to include the assertion, the deliberate assertion, that it is capable of being applied as efficiently to "those nobler departments of human need" in which he was known to be so interested—did it never occur to the scholar to inquire why he did not so apply it himself to those very subjects, instead of keeping so steadfastly to the physical forces in his illustration of its powers?"

"Has anyone ever read the plan of this man's works? Has anyone seen the scheme of that great enterprise? . . . . And if it has been seen, what is the reason there has been no enquiry made for those works in which the author openly proposes to apply his organum in person to those very subjects; and that too when he takes pains to tell us that he is not a vain promiser!"

"There is a pretence of supplying that new kind of history which is put down as the Third Part of the Instauration, though the natural history produced for that purpose is very far from fulfilling the promise . . . . . But where is the FOURTH PART of the Great Instauration? . . . . . Where is that so important part for which all that precedes it is a preparation? Where is that part which consists of EXAMPLES? Where are the works in which he undertakes to show it in operation, with its new "*grappling hooks on the matter of human life*", applied by the inventor himself "to the noblest subjects"? Where (in Bacon's words) is "that part of our work which enters upon PHILOSOPHY ITSELF?"

Here is a problem which has not been solved, certainly not by Lord Bacon's biographers; a problem so courageously apprehended by Delia—with all the world against her—that we have re-stated it here in her own breathless, passionate and involved sentences, because she was the pioneer who reached it by a process of pure literary criticism. She set to work without help of ciphers, emblems and all the external corroborative evidence which has since been collected. She worked as a solitary without benefit of discourse, and without initiation into the

---

\*i.e. *Natural History*.

records of some secret society which would of course have bound her to silence. In a word, she blazed the trail alone.

This trail, which leads into the innermost courts of our English literature, is less difficult to follow today. Relevant books are now available, and although much may have to be rejected or set aside (for genius is akin to lunacy), we are led to the point where, in Bacon's own words, his writings were intended "to select" his readers. But looking back over a century to the year 1857, it seems to me most extraordinary that this charming, lonely and impecunious New Englander could have learned so much and travelled so far in advance of her Age.

If we may, for a moment, set aside the painstaking but inconclusive notes of Spedding and review the substance of Delia's argument it seems clear that Bacon really did come to a point where he felt compelled to pause in this theoretical work in order to provide "examples" to "pray in aid of similes". It was useless to go further without giving an inkling of the harvest he expected. The audience, if not shown something more tangible—something that would "strike the senses"—would soon fall asleep. So, like a lecturer in chemistry who revives interest by producing a bang or a smell or a green-coloured gas, Bacon now draws our attention to "examples", in successive phases of thought—physical, emotional and spiritual—in the crude physics of the *Sylva*, the still cruder outrages and extravagances of human beings in the Shakespeare Plays, and lastly in that most serene of all visions of the future, the majestic unhurried grace of the *New Atlantis*.

\* \* \* \*

It may be suggested that in all this there is nothing really new, that poets and prophets from time immemorial had clothed their visions in the flesh and blood of fables and mysteries, and that the incarnation of "principles" in the mythical persons of gods and goddesses was almost as old as Mount Olympus itself. And certainly Delia herself reminds us that this idea—the idea of dramatising some lesson for the sake of those who could be reached in no other way—was not a new idea but had been used "by men of the gravest learning and accomplishments" some two thousand years earlier.

But Bacon himself admitted all this. In his treatise on the *Wisdom of the Ancients* he even went further, and traced the ancient myths and fables as coming "like a thin rarified air" from a remote prehistoric and more enlightened past, as sacred relics from a more golden age....

"whence they fell like faint whisperings into the trumpets and flutes of the Greeks."

It was the break in continuity, the curtain of darkness which had fallen between ancient times and our own, that he most regretted. For it was a darkness that had seldom been illuminated and often deepened, by argumentative logic and the barren disputations of the mediæval Church.

In support of Delia's contention that Lord Bacon did in fact



provide an actual beginning to the supposed missing FOURTH PART of his philosophy, we have the following deliberate statements by him which are otherwise unintelligible. ....

1. In describing his method of enforcing hope by bringing men to "particulars", he not only refers to those "instances" which, as we know, are examined and digested in the SECOND PART (i.e. in the *Novum Organum*), but "principally" to those "examples" which are the subject of the FOURTH PART, and which relate to. ....

"Certain subjects of the noblest kind, but greatly differing from each other, that a specimen may be had of every sort. By these EXAMPLES we mean not illustrations of rules and precepts, but perfect models which EXEMPLIFY THE SECOND PART. .... and represent to the EYE the whole progress of the mind. .... in the more chosen subjects; after the same manner as globes and machines facilitate the more abstruse and subtle demonstrations in mathematics.

2. In the *Wisdom of the Ancients*, while ridiculing the use of poetry in physical science as attempted by the alchemists, Bacon tells us that the dramatic, poetic or allegorical demonstration is the most useful in certain chosen subjects, because it opens an easy and familiar road to the human understanding, without arousing opposition.

3. He openly proposes to apply his new method in person to these very subjects, and is at some pains to inform us that he is not a "vain promiser." And finally he very discreetly "raises a question" in order to forestall an "objection" ....

"Some may raise this question rather than objection, whether we talk of perfecting natural philosophy alone according to our method, or the other sciences such as Ethics, Logic, Politics. *We certainly intend to comprehend them all.* For we form a history and tables of invention for ANGER, FEAR AND SHAME AND ALSO FOR EXAMPLES IN CIVIL LIFE. .... As well as for Heat, Cold, Vegetation and the Like".

Since little that Bacon wrote was idle, and all was subject to continual revision, these statements must be taken at their face value. Everything which flowed from his pen in his younger years (even stage-plays if he wrote them) was perpetually under review, and gradually shaped to some undisclosed purpose.\* Even the famous *Essays* were not exempt from this evolutionary process, the final versions being among the most perfect.† The "Two Books" of the 1605 *Advancement of Learning* were greatly expanded to the Nine Books of the 1623 *De Augmentis*. The *Novum Organum* began in the early "Cogitata et Visa" and went through twelve successive revisions, according to his chaplain Rawley.

Now it so happens that, over precisely the same period of time, the Shakespeare Plays (apparently never once mentioned by Bacon!) went through a similar metamorphosis, the most striking changes

\*cf. Bacon's letter to Father Fulgentio "nothing is finished till all be finished".

†cf. Macaulay's essay on Lord Bacon.

occurring after the death of the actor Shakespere in 1616, and principally in the First Folio of 1623.

Here then is a means of testing Delia Bacon's hypothesis. If the authorship of the 1623 Folio and the 1623 *De Augmentis* was identical, and if this person had been engaged in perfecting both books for many years, we should expect to find some indication of a parallel change of personal opinion in the gradual evolution of both works, even though the subjects are dissimilar. And so it is. Mr. Bertram Theobald\* has traced several of those instances which are most instructive, and we select the following.....

In the 1604 quarto of *Hamlet* there appears this line:

".....Sense sure you have  
Else you could not have motion."

This has been a stumbling block to commentators, and various explanations have been suggested. Turn to Bacon's works and the solution is found. In 1605 he published the first edition of the *Advancement of Learning*, in which he still held the ancient doctrine that everything which has motion must have sense or sensibility. But in the *De Augmentis* of 1623 he frankly renounces this view, saying that it was an error on the part of some of the old philosophers. Thus from 1605 or earlier, till 1623 he retained his original belief and in 1623 changed it. So did the author of the plays—already in his grave! The quartos of 1604, 1605, 1611 and the undated quarto all preserve this notion, but in the Folio of 1623 it is revised because it no longer fitted with the opinions of the true author."\*\*

This certainly suggests that the real author was still alive! Now these thoughtful revisions in the Folio text were not always dramatic improvements, nor are they all a credit from the scientific point of view; but they do bear witness to a care for literature and the careful integration of both works. I quote again from Theobald . . .

"In the 1604 *Hamlet* the author gives expression to the popular belief in the moon's influence upon the tides of the sea. Bacon also held this view, certainly in 1594, and for all we know in 1604. Every quarto edition of *Hamlet* contains this same idea; but in the 1623 Folio it was omitted. Why? Because meanwhile, in 1616, Bacon had written his investigations on the subject entitled *De Fluxu et Refluxu Maris*, in which he withdrew his support of that view. Yet the supposed deceased author of the Plays still danced to his tune!"

Further instances reflecting the changing opinions of the author can be given; but what we have quoted above will serve as a strong corroboration of Delia Bacon's hypothesis.

\* \* \* \* \*

It has been said with some justification that experience is the food of the soul. If this be in any way true, the value of imaginative fiction can hardly be over-estimated. For this is a great experimental

---

\* "Enter Francis Bacon", Cecil Pelman, 1932.

\*\*N.B. Readers who wish to check this point should make sure that their "Shakespeare" gives the "Folio" text of *Hamlet* and not the "Quarto" text which is often substituted.

field of the mind, in which personal experiences may be extended, and afterwards weighed and considered. It is *par excellence* the field in which ideas can be developed and desires and emotions balanced and counter-balanced. In resorting to fiction Bacon was simply adopting the method of all Utopians from Plato to Sir Thomas More. For as he himself tells us in the *Wisdom of the Ancients*. . . . .

"Now just as Hieroglyphics were before letters, so were parables before arguments. And even now if anyone wishes to bring new light into the human mind without harshness of offence, he must still go the same way and avail himself of similitudes."

Possibly it was just as well that King James affected not to "understand" the Instauration, and that neither he nor his ministers could see the potential "dynamite" in the First Folio. It was perhaps better that only a few trusted friends, like Ben Jonson, Rawley, Meautys, Tobie Mathew, Bishop Lancelot Andrews, Father Fulgentio, and certain trusted Frenchmen, should actually know what was at stake.

On the other hand it must have been with a heavy heart that Bacon, because of the King's indifference, felt compelled to write the first ten "Centuries" of the *Natural History* by himself. The Architect had to become the bricklayer, as he jokingly said to Rawley. Yet if Delia is right, not only did this serve as a most useful "blind", but he had other consolations too.

In the quiet seclusion of Gorhambury or Canonbury Tower or Gray's Inn, he could often turn with a lighter heart to the wider screen of an imagined dramatic universe. There he could manipulate, like puppets, the human embodiments of all principles, affections, virtues and passions worthy to be used as steps in his "ladder of the mind". Thence, in those borrowed historical forms which were to grow to the stature, the gigantic stature of a Lear, a Macbeth, an Othello or a Timon, he could begin to enter men's minds "obliquely".

Peradventure it is in this setting—in the seclusion of his garden or study—that one of the most devoted of his disciples has found him. And, whether her vision of him be true or no, surely so merciful and discerning a judge will not have trampled upon her homage. For it is not on the pinnacle of his outward fame that she would rest him, but on the seat of an inward and spiritual learning, chin in hand, deep in contemplation. There, laying aside the great Seals of England, laying aside his reputation, laying aside his "hat and rapier", and assuming the magic robe of Prospero, he could enter that part of the Great Instauration which relates to *Philosophy Itself*.

(to be continued)



## FRANCIS BACON'S MILIEU

By NOEL FERMOR

**W**ALKING slowly but attentively through the galleries, one felt suddenly transported by some magic of the pictorial arts, to the splendours of the first Elizabethan age.

The popularity of the British Portraits Winter Exhibition at the Royal Academy of Arts, and the rich selection of paintings, miniatures, and busts displayed there, bore witness to the importance of having preserved for posterity the likenesses of our countrymen who lived in past ages. Amongst these were included many of the outstanding personalities of their times, selected for the interesting characterization betrayed in their faces and demeanour, and depicted for the study of succeeding generations usually by celebrated artists, men of discernment and timeless talent.

The robust and flinty countenance of old Sir Nicholas Bacon, wisest of the Queen's counsellors, the erect puritanical figure of his wife, the erudite Lady Anne, the arrogance of Essex, and the fastidiousness of Sir Thomas Meautys,—all these seemed to call to one in turn. Yet somehow, in this great collection, one missed the wide-eyed mystical gaze of Francis, greatest of the Bacons, looking ahead of us all to some ideal commonwealth of the future, some New Atlantis of his own imagining. Knowledge of Francis Bacon's personal appearance and characteristics and that of the circle of relatives and acquaintances in which he moved is of some importance if we are to preserve a properly balanced assessment of his work and achievements, and it is to be hoped that at least our London members were fortunate enough to see the XVIth and XVIIth century exhibits at Burlington House, which included a number of works of especial interest to Baconians.

The three portraits of Queen Elizabeth I are probably too well-known to call for extended reference, those exhibited being one attributed to Marcus Gheeraerts the Elder, another to Federico Zuccari including, according to Camden, the favourite symbolical device of the Queen, *viz.*, a sieve without water falling through, carried to indicate her virginal integrity, and one by Hans Eworth (1569) which is mainly symbolical in character. The subject of cypher works and symbolism in Elizabethan portraiture is too complex to be even touched upon here, but can be pursued by reference to John Clennell's article *Symbolic Portraits*, which appeared in *Baconiana* No. 137, in the Autumn of 1950.

Three busts of Sir Nicholas Bacon and family, however, were of absorbing interest, since each was extraordinarily life-like and gave a truly faithful reproduction of the subject's features and appearance. The artist in each case is unknown, but all are believed to have stood in

Gorhambury, Sir Nicholas' home, built by him in 1568. Readers may remember that after a comment by Queen Elizabeth to him on its smallness, the house was enlarged by the Lord Keeper. We are left wondering whether this was by Royal Command, and what significance her four recorded visits, and the subsequent domicile there of Francis Bacon, might have had. All three painted terra-cotta busts belong to the present Earl of Verulam's collection, but that commonly held to be of Francis Bacon seemed to bear a striking family resemblance to Anne, Lady Bacon (née Cooke) in facial characteristics and might possibly be of Anthony Bacon, her "elder" son. This viewpoint may be borne out by the costume worn which appears to favour the earlier date.

Lady Anne's sculpture displayed moral rectitude in every line, not only in visage, but in the erect carriage of the head, the straight set of the shoulders and the fine, firm tracery of the lips. The Puritan was clearly revealed, but by no means obscured the refined sensitivity of "perhaps the most celebrated of Elizabethan learned ladies", as the catalogue had it.

Sensitivity and a freer, gentler artistry were well portrayed in the most ambitious of Sir Nathaniel Bacon's self-portraits, believed to have been painted *circa* 1625, the year before Francis Bacon's recorded death. Sir Nathaniel died in 1627, and was the grandson of Sir Nicholas, and the presumed step-nephew of Francis. He was a man of considerable accomplishment, not only in painting but also in other intellectual interests, which are duly listed in the portrait exhibited. This was lent by the present Earl of Verulam, having come into the possession of the family in the late XVIIth century by way of Sir Nathaniel's child Anne, who first married Sir Thomas Meautys, and later Sir Harbottle Grimston.

In Sir Thomas we recognise the secretary and *confidant* of Francis, and it was surely a happy thought on the part of the organisers to include a fine portrait of him by an unknown artist of the Anglo-Dutch school, possibly Sir Nathaniel Bacon. This picture depicts the serene and artistic face of a cultured Elizabethan gentleman, and was handed down, with the Gorhambury estate left to Sir Thomas by Lord St. Alban after his death, to the aforesaid Lady Anne Meautys' second husband. An interesting topical note may be interpolated here with reference to Sir Thomas' tomb which is sited under the floor of the nave in St. Michael's Church, St. Albans, near the chancel. For some time it had been known to the Society that the inscription on the flagstone had been marred by chisel-marks, obliterating part of the lettering.

In November, 1956, the inscription was restored, apparently on the instructions of Lord Verulam, and now appears as follows.

HERE LYETH THE BODY OF  
SR. THOMAS MEAUTYS KT. &  
ONE OF THE CLARKES OF HIS  
LATE MATS. MOST HON<sup>LL</sup> PRIVIE  
COUNCELL AN<sup>O</sup>. DNI 1649

Perhaps some member could confirm that this rendering has faithfully reproduced the old. The mystery of the original defacement still remains and has never been satisfactorily explained as far as we are aware.

The neatly woven tapestry of Francis Bacon's *milieu* would surely have continued to entrance the Baconian visitor as he wandered through the Elizabethan Gallery; but, perforce, only a perfunctory mention can be made of the intriguing paintings of William Cecil, first Baron Burghley, the father of Francis Bacon's life-long enemy, and of Sir Thomas Lucy (1585-1640), owner of Charlecote Park, Warwickshire, and the supposed victim of Shakespeare's poaching activities. But these exhibits led us to one of greater interest—a painting of "Robert Devereux Earl of Essex 1590", by Sir William or Sir Francis Segar, lent by the National Gallery of Ireland. The strong, determined features would certainly be in character with the stormy career of this Elizabethan adventurer, and the lack of the calm, aristocratic air so evident in the portraits of such as Sir Thomas Meautys would certainly seem significant. The mien is haughty, the carriage arrogant, and tolerance and moderation are largely absent. In the expert view, however, the identification of the subject is not altogether certain, and the picture must be compared with other extant portraits, of which there are several.

Another portrait of more than passing interest was that of Henry Wriothesley, Earl of Southampton, the friend of Essex and Francis Bacon, the nobleman to whom *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece* were dedicated, and (according to some orthodox critics), the original "Mr. W. H.", "the onlie begetter", mentioned in the dedication to the Sonnets. This opinion is not, of course, shared by most Baconians, and again, the picture of the sitter showing coarse features, unkempt locks and a mixed sallow and red out-door complexion, appears to argue against an academic nature.

Philip Herbert, fourth Earl of Pembroke, and one of the two noblemen—that "incomparable pair"—to whom the Dedication to the 1632 Folio Edition of the Shakespeare Plays was addressed, was a patron of the arts and believed to have had associations with Francis Bacon. The portrait exhibited was only correctly identified in 1950. Next but one was hung a painting by an unknown artist of Sir Henry Nevill, dated 1582, and lent by Lt.-Colonel Sir Edmund Bacon, Bt., the premier baronet of England. This work shows two crested finger rings, one with the family arms of Bacon, *viz.* the boar passant with mullet argent.

It will be remembered that the Nevill motto appears upon the cover of the Northumberland Manuscript.

The main *corpus* of paintings which was particularly intriguing to the Baconian visitor has now been described, but mention must be made of three additional exhibits. One is a picture of Spencer Compton, 2nd Earl of Northampton (1601-43), who was an ancestor of the present Marquess of Northampton, from whom our Society sub-leases rooms in Canonbury Tower, a building of great historical value, which is known



to have been rented by Francis Bacon and believed to have been used by him as a residence. The other two are busts of Dr. William Harvey (1578-1657) to whom "M.P." made reference in *The Pioneer* last time, and who first lectured on the circulation of the blood to the College of Physicians. Dr. Harvey was Physician Extraordinary to Queen Elizabeth, and later, Court Physician to King James, and Francis Bacon was in a position to hear personally about this theory which is so aptly illustrated in *Coriolanus*. The lecture was first delivered in 1616, the play was first published in 1623, and the treatise first published in 1628. The dating is surely significant since Shakespeare died in 1616, too soon to have learned of Harvey's work or to have alluded to it in a Play printed seven years *after* his own death.

It is indeed thrilling to consider, even so tersely, the wealth of contemporary evidence concerning Francis Bacon and his associates which was presented to those with eyes to see at Burlington House, and we cannot conclude without acknowledging gratefully the invaluable notes in the Catalogue detailing the background to the historic paintings displayed at the 1956/7 Winter Exhibition.

## *New Publication*

# A WINTER'S TALE

By Mrs. Beryl Pogson

Price 2/10 (including postage)

## BACON'S VINDICATION

By H. KENDRA BAKER

**I**t is generally supposed that Spedding's "Evenings with a Reviewer" constitutes a "Vindication" of Francis Bacon's character for rectitude; but as such it leaves much to be desired.

So far as the "bribery" charges are concerned Spedding's conclusions are little more than an "Excuse for his guilt"; they cannot be regarded as "proof of his innocence."

Those who are concerned to show that Francis Bacon was a man of "clean hands and a clean heart" must beware lest in leaning upon Spedding they do but find him a broken reed.

It is to William Hepworth Dixon that the manifestation of Francis Bacon's complete innocence is due, and Baconians owe to him a deep debt of gratitude for raising the level of this great man's vindication from mere "extenuating circumstances" to a demonstration of stainless integrity. It was in consequence of Macaulay's grossly unjust review of Basil Montague's "Life and Works of Francis Bacon" (1825/34), that Spedding wrote in 1845, his memorable Work, "Evenings with a Reviewer." In this, in the form of a dialogue between a reader and himself, he dissects Macaulay's statements and shows him to be prejudiced, politically biassed, and in many cases totally inaccurate. For some unknown reason this book, which was privately printed, was not published until 1881, after Spedding's death.

It is stated in the Dictionary of National Biography that it was never seen by Macaulay, who died in 1859. Spedding had, however, in his lifetime, published his monumental edition of Bacon's Works in 7 volumes, from 1857 to 1859; and, in as many volumes, "Lord Bacon's Letters and Life", from 1861 to 1874. The latter, in an abridged form, appeared in 1878 in 2 volumes under the title of "The Life and Times of Francis Bacon," from which most of the original documents that interrupted the narrative have been omitted. His views and conclusions as appearing in both "The Letters and Life" and "The Life and Times" appear to be substantially the same as those expressed in his "Evenings with a Reviewer," which, as we have said, though written in 1845, had not yet been published. There are, however, a few footnotes and references which will be dealt with later in connection with Dixon's researches.

At the moment it will suffice to make it clear that Spedding's view, as contained in the "Evenings" showed no material change in either of his subsequent works. The significance of this will be apparent as we proceed.

And now we come to William Hepworth Dixon.

By profession a barrister, his qualifications peculiarly fitted him for research in those technical intricacies which might very well prove

almost impenetrable and unintelligible to a layman. He was a trenchant writer and a formidable protagonist of any cause he espoused.

In 1854, the Dictionary of National Biography tells us, "Dixon began his researches in regard to Francis Bacon. He procured through the intervention of Lord Stanley and Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton leave to inspect the State Papers, *which had been hitherto jealously guarded from the general view by successive Secretaries of State.*"

We have italicised the letter passage in order to emphasise the fact that his researches were *new*.

He published, as the result of his researches, "The Personal History of Lord Bacon," in 1861, and a much augmented work, "The Story of Lord Bacon's Life" in 1862. "Dixon's books upon Bacon," says the D.N.B., "obtained wide popularity both at home and abroad, but have not been highly valued by subsequent investigators. (See Spedding's remarks in Bacon i, 386)."

Now, this disparaging qualification appears to be based solely on the one isolated remark of Spedding to which they refer, and from the following evidence it will be seen that it is unwarrantable. First, let us make it clear that Spedding knew of Dixon's *Essay* (1861) prior to the publication of his "Letters and Life" (1861) for not only is it referred to in footnotes but also in the text. In Vol. I there are three indexed references in all, two in the text and one in the footnotes. It is to one of these textual allusions that the D.N.B. refers. At Vol. I. p. 386 (Letters and Life) he questions Dixon's conclusions as to the inferences concerning the Earl of Essex to be drawn from a certain Masque believed to have been written by Bacon. He is referring, be it noted, to the 1861 *Essay*, and it is significant that Dixon—as though anxious not to rely on any evidence that might be thought doubtful or questionable—omits all references to such Masque in his subsequent *Book* (1862).

Now, the writer in the D.N.B. does not seem to have taken the trouble to refer to Spedding's "Life and Times" (1878); for had he done so he would have found that Spedding on his part had dropped his criticism concerning Dixon's "inferences," owing presumably to Dixon having omitted the passage from his later Work. Thus, in allowing this disparaging reference to Dixon to remain in the D.N.B., the writer betrays either his prejudice or his ignorance; in either case he betrays his inaccuracy.

It may be mentioned, too, that in Vol. II of the Letters and Life (1882) Spedding, referring to an incident in Essex's career which "popular narratives with one accord forget to mention," puts a footnote that "this was written before the appearance" of Dixon's *Essay* (1861), thereby excluding Dixon from the stricture. This "scienter" (as the Lawyers call it) on Spedding's part concerning Dixon's *Essay* as well as his subsequent book, has a very important bearing on the former's attitude towards Dixon, especially in view of the far-reaching results of Dixon's researches, and their effect on Spedding's conclusions.

That Dixon honestly, and modestly, tried to profit by the criticisms which his first effort, the "Essay" (1861) evoked, is shewn by



what he says in the "Note" to his subsequent book, "The Story of Lord Bacon's Life" (1862). He writes:—

"The brief Essay on the Personal History of Lord Bacon was published about a year ago, and a second edition followed the first too quickly to allow of my profiting by the discussions to which it gave rise. In the wide and warm acceptance which it gained, an acceptance more immediate than I had dared to hope for, some critics said, most truly, that many things were left unexplained, particularly as to the Apology and the Confession. When, however, it appeared that nearly all objections to a true history of Bacon's life arose either from forgetfulness of what was otherwise known, or from carelessness in fitting the new matter to the old, and that these objections would vanish on the facts being set in their true order, it was clear that if some one would tell the story of Bacon's life in a brief space, and in such a way as to deal with all the facts under controversy, he would be doing a service. I had not sought this labour; circumstances thrust it on me. My Essay was reprinted in Boston and Leipsic. Requests were made to translate it into French, German, and Italian. A new Edition was called for in London. How could I give it to the world again without answering by facts the objections still urged against the nobler view of Bacon's life? Voices from many sides called on me to proceed in the work I had begun. The Hatfield Papers offered me much new detail on the Essex Plot, and the important discovery in the Six Clerks' Office of Bacon's Chancery-books, put me in possession of new and official materials for a history of the charges of Judicial Bribery. Finding my former case strengthened at every point by these revelations I fell to work, cheerily obtained from Sir John Romilly free access to the Chancery-books, and from Mr. T. Duffus Hardy valuable aid in deciphering and abstracting them. *I sought the advice and obtained the approval of some of the most eminent lawyers on the Bench.* The result is now before the Reader."

This "nobler view of Bacon's life" of which he speaks is no less than the difference between "extenuation" and complete "exoneration," and it will thus be seen of what enormous value were Dixon's investigations. It will also be seen that they were *new*, and that they were into *official records*. They cannot therefore be treated lightly. It would be impossible in a short article to indicate, even in outline, the scope of the investigations, nor is it proposed to attempt it.

Suffice it to say here that Spedding, when he wrote his "Evenings" must obviously have been unaware of a large mass of the evidence collected by Dixon as a result of his researches and as subsequently published and fully documented. In particular it would seem that Spedding could have had no knowledge whatever of the prevailing "fee-system"—the most essential feature of the whole situation—or he could never have made many of the statements he does. For example:—

"And though I admit that *his removal was necessary by his own fault* (our italics), I think no one will maintain that the affairs of the Nation went the better for his absence." (Vol. II, p. 249).

Dixon's researches show conclusively that such an "Admission" is wholly unwarrantable, and so far as the subsequent "affairs of the Nation" are concerned, the reference is irrelevant to the issue, which is the innocence or guilt of the Chancellor.

The "Fee-System" which had existed from time immemorial, pernicious and objectionable as it undoubtedly was, was yet the only means by which "judges were paid their wages" as Alford stated in the House of Commons on the Debate. The receipt of these fees in the shape of "voluntary benevolences" (just as are Counsel's fees—in theory—to this day) was perfectly regular, so long as they were not paid and received *pendente lite*, which Dixon proves was not the case in the charges framed against Bacon.

Thus when Spedding "admits" Bacon's removal to have been due to his own "fault," he is both historically and ethically wrong, and no amount of "excuses" are either needful or relevant, for there is no "fault" to excuse.

Had he attacked the "fee-system," he would have been justified.

Again (p. 253) he regards Bacon's conduct as a "referee on the question of law" in the Mompesson affair (the granting of a licence to Mompesson to manufacture gold thread) as "Strange and unaccountable."

The Records show that it was neither, but perfectly regular and in accordance with Bacon's plain duty to the King. He could not have acted otherwise without a breach of his official duties.

And then comes this passage (p. 257). A., quoting from Macaulay, "In his judicial capacity—"

B. (that is, Spedding), "Stay; we are now coming to Bacon's real delinquency 'the little picture of night work remaining among the fair and excellent tables of his acts and works; *which he never himself affected to excuse, but penitently acknowledges the faults* (our italics) and submitted without a murmur to the very severe punishment with which they were visited. No true friend to his memory will affect to find him blameless here," &c.

Well, all we can say is that a very "true friend to his memory"—Hepworth Dixon, to wit—has not only "affected to find him blameless here," but has demonstrated the fact conclusively.

Spedding could never for one moment have considered the true implications of the erroneously so-called, "Confession and Submission" which does but admit the *abuses of the fee-system*, a system which Bacon had pledged himself to abolish—given time—among other prevailing abuses. What he thought of such a system is clearly indicated in his "New Atlantis," where the Perfect State is outlined. There is not a word in this "Confession" which can be justly construed as an acknowledgement of personal guilt, beyond, perhaps, the pathetic plea that amid the overwhelming responsibilities and labours of his High Office, he may not have adequately "overlooked" his subordinate officers—whose villainies, by the way, had brought these troubles upon him.

The "Submission" is shown to have been made at the urgent

entreaty of his weak and ungrateful Monarch in order to spare his Favourite. What was demanded of him was not a "Defence" but a "Submission," a "Sacrifice," not a "Vindication."

This the somewhat unimaginative Spedding seems to have been incapable of appreciating but there is really very little excuse for him, seeing that, quite apart from the Evidence adduced by Dixon, the very facts set out in this so-called "Confession" speak for themselves to those who have eyes to see, and rebut all suggestions of personal guilt.

It is amazing that even on the evidence before him, Spedding could have used such expressions, especially as "the very severe punishment" was never exacted.

And here again, on p. 264:—A. (quoting again from Macaulay), "He and his dependants accepted large presents from persons who were engaged in Chancery suits."

B. "That at last is true; and I admit that it was a great fault."

Poor Spedding! "A great fault" to do what every Chancellor and Judge had done for centuries in accordance with the recognised "fee-system"! Had Spedding ever considered whence practically *all* public officials derived their emoluments—from the Archbishop and Lord Chancellor downwards?

There was no such thing as a Civil List in those days and everybody, as Dixon shows, subsisted on "voluntary benevolences."

We can hardly realise such a pernicious system in these days of State-paid officials, but it was the prevailing—and only—system by which officials were paid in *those* days, and to speak of "a fault" under such circumstances is to betray a really reprehensible ignorance of the conditions of the period. That Bacon should be sacrificed on the altar for abuses he had but inherited, was not only grossly unjust but was—as Dixon shows—solely due to the machinations of certain unscrupulous place-seekers who wanted not Reforms, but the Seals for their own purposes.

That the abuses which were made the pretext for Bacon's persecution were, in no particular, remedied after his "fall," but were in fact accentuated until these place-seekers had met with their deserts, is clear evidence that Dixon's conclusions were well-founded, and that Spedding's "admissions" and "excuses" were totally erroneous.

Let one or two more such extracts suffice.

p.288. "I hope it will appear that this page of his life was not one total blot, *however ineffaceable be the great blot which he suffered to fall upon it* (our italics).

p.289. "I think that Bacon *was* guilty (his italics) of corruption: that he had not the means of clearing himself; that the sentence pronounced against him, though severe, was not unjust; that his act moreover was not only in law indefensible, but in morals culpable, and more culpable in him than it would have been in another man; that he had, in short, allowed himself to do that which he knew ought not to be done. *To this extent he himself pleaded guilty and I plead guilty for him.*" (Our italics.)

Now these two statements—from a “Vindicator”!—are really rather startling, and one cannot but feel that it was fortunate for Spedding that Macaulay was not privileged to peruse them, for his comments might have necessitated a few more “Evenings with a Reviewer.”

Of what use are excuses and extenuations in the face of such uncompromising and damaging admissions?

And it only seems to make matters worse when later (p.298) he seeks to show that “it was as a *Judge* only, not as a *gentleman* that Bacon transgressed.”

He says, “we are apt to mix up with our feeling that the practice of receiving gifts of any kind was *corrupt* (which is true) a feeling that the practice of taking *money* was *ungentlemanly*, which is a mistake.”

We doubt very much if this subtle distinction would have much weight with any modern admirer of Bacon. It was reserved for Dixon to show that not one of the many “admissions” is justified by the facts.

Extracts of this character from Spedding’s book could be multiplied, one might almost say *ad nauseum*; certainly *ad misericordiam*, but it is felt that enough has been said, not only to justify our previous assertion, but to show that this Work—though “parts of it are excellent”—is on the whole an exceedingly dangerous one for Baconians to quote or rely upon. However specious may be the “excuses” (and with these we do not propose to concern ourselves, as they do not appeal to us) the very admissions are enough to stultify any plea of innocence. Had Baconians no better evidence of Bacon’s integrity than that which Spedding furnishes, they would indeed be in a bad way.

It is sad to have to write thus of one whose life’s work it was to vindicate Bacon; all one can say is that he did his best with the materials available to him, and we honour him for his splendid motive and his indefatigable labours.

But we must not allow our feelings of admiration and respect for Spedding to blind us to the fact that it is to Dixon’s efforts that Bacon’s innocence has been made manifest, however his “frailties” may have been previously extenuated.

And this brings us to a question of some delicacy, namely how Dixon’s findings were viewed by Spedding. We have already seen that his “Evenings,” though written in 1845 was not published until 1881—36 years later, after his death. One wonders why.

G. S. Venables in his Preface to the work says: “The friends who at the time received copies of the book regretted with good reason Spedding’s resolution to postpone the publication; and he seems, after a long interval to have discovered his mistake in suppressing his more compendious vindication of Bacon’s character.”

Venables writes earlier: “his vindication of the character of Bacon is, as he intended, complete and conclusive.” We can only leave it to the reader to judge of this for himself on the quotations furnished as samples from bulk.

That Spedding knew of Dixon’s “Essay,” with all its new matter, is clear from what has already been said; that he knew, also of the later



"Book" (1862) can only be judged inferentially from the fact that in his "Life and Times" his criticism of a certain passage in the "Essay" (omitted from the "Book") is dropped out—presumably as superfluous. This "Book" of 1862 contains, as mentioned, a considerable amount of additional new matter having a most important bearing upon Spedding's conclusions.

So far as can be ascertained, Dixon's findings were not "acclaimed" by Spedding as one might, perhaps reasonably, have expected, seeing that their object was identical with his own. The footnote we have quoted shows that he *acknowledged* Dixon's researches, but we very much regret to have to say that it is doubtful if he *welcomed* them. Indeed, in a footnote at p.484 of Vol. I. of the "Life and Times" (which work contains but three indexed references to Dixon) he speaks somewhat slightly of certain inferences by Dixon concerning some guests at Bacon's wedding. This coupled with the tone of his observations in his "Letters and Life" on the other matter to which reference has already been made, causes one—albeit reluctantly—to entertain a suspicion of professional jealousy.

One hesitates to suggest such a thing in the case of such a great man as Spedding, but human nature is imperfect even at its greatest and it must not be forgotten that Spedding had given thirty years of his life to this great object.

It is strange that these important and far-reaching discoveries by Dixon should be accorded but three minor references in the two volumes of Spedding's "Life and Times" published long after Dixon's later book had appeared in 1862.

Be that as it may, we are not concerned with Spedding's feelings but with facts, as discovered by Dixon, and their vital bearing on the innocence or guilt of Francis Bacon.

Our present object is but to show that Spedding can only be accepted *pro tanto*, and that it is to Dixon that we must look for that full and detailed demonstration of innocence that alone can satisfy the needs of the case.

It is with this "nobler view" alone that Baconians are concerned, for it must be shown that Francis Bacon, as Lord Chancellor, was clean of hand and heart to justify Hallam's description of him as "the wisest and greatest of mankind."

## THE MASKS OF AN EARLIER LORD KEEPER

By R. W. GIBSON

THE use of pseudonyms has always been a common practice; it was employed most extensively in the XVIIth and early XVIIIth centuries and it persists to-day. It has been stated that the motive is often a display of some form of timidity or diffidence, a fear of consequences, or maybe, shame, but there are many other reasons too. As Lord Bacon observed "an habit of secrecy is both moral and politic."

Sir Thomas More, known to the Roman Catholic Church as Saint Thomas More, adopted this practice in the reign of Henry VIII. More's use of the name *Guilielmus Rosseus*—William Ross, —to his work *Responsio ad convitia Martini Lutheri*, 1523 (STC. 18089) is an early example of pseudonymic usage, the necessity of which is not hard to find. Thomas Stapleton and Harpsfield, More's first biographers, both stated that there was, in fact, a man William Ross who at this time went on a pilgrimage to Rome and died in Italy. Consequently people assumed (or were meant to) that he was the writer of the *Responsio* and did not suspect More of its authorship. Ross's death abroad was most opportune and convenient. More kept his secret by many times referring in his other works to Ross as the author, and at no time did he acknowledge himself responsible for the *Responsio*.

More took over the King's quarrel with Martin Luther, and in his reply, undoubtedly under royal direction, uses language as violent as his opponent: 'Soused in the mire' etc. It makes most unpleasant reading and it is difficult to understand that such invective and abuse could come from the same hand as that which wrote *Utopia*. In the peroration (as More calls it) of the book he apologises for an obnoxious task, and states: "I am in no fear, gentle reader, that your equity will not readily condone your finding so often in this book things from which I think our modesty will recoil. Nothing more distressing could have happened to me than to have been coerced by necessity into saying that which might offend pure ears with impure words."

More and Bacon, both Lord Chancellors and both great utopians and visionaries are often cited as opposites in character. It is difficult to agree to this. Both took the oath of allegiance to the Crown so seriously, that in More's case he felt compelled to accept martyrdom rather than give in; in Bacon's case he seems to have abandoned his defences at King James's bidding, rather than involve the Court with the Commons on the question of "Voluntary Benevolences".\* Both were compelled by the ugly side of Tudor despotism to write some things "under direction". Bacon's "Declaration of the treason of the late Earl of Essex"—a command performance—was a case in point. Bacon, surviving the Tudor despotism, was able to put the finishing touches to much of his work. It was, however, a great pity that *The New Atlantis* was never completed by him.

\* cf. Bacon's letter to King James reported by Thomas Bushell. "I wish.... that, as I am the first so I may be the last sacrifice in your time".

# TOWARDS A MORE CORRECT BIOGRAPHY OF FRANCIS BACON

(extracts from an essay by the late Parker Woodward)

## Part V

**I**n Bacon's later life (1620/1), Ben Jonson was to make a pointed reference to a mystery concerning his illustrious friend and patron.

But in the year 1593/4, now being dealt with, probably even Ben Jonson was unaware of Bacon's secret labours. Having failed to obtain Treasury support for his secret literary work, Francis was anxious to obtain one of the richly remunerated law offices of the Crown. To achieve this he proceeded for the first time, at the advanced age of thirty-three, to demonstrate his intimate knowledge of law and his forensic ability. On the 25th of January he made his first appearance in court as a practising barrister. He did well, and Lord Burleigh sent his secretary to congratulate "unto him the first fruits of his public practice", and to ask for a note of his case and the chief points of his pleading "to the end he might make report thereof there where it might do him the most good". Where it might "do him the most good" was of course with the Queen.

On 5th February he pleaded in another case, and on the 9th February he was fixed to plead and did plead in the Exchequer Chamber. It was to have been an important test of his quality as a lawyer. Lord Keeper Puckering, Lord Treasurer Burleigh (if able) were to be present, and also the two Lord Chief Justices, and two other judges from each bench, to form their opinions concerning his capabilities. The Lord Chief Baron, and all the Barons of the Exchequer, were to preside over the arguments. Gosnold wrote about the event:—

"The unusual words wherewith he (Francis) spangled his speech were rather gracious for their propriety than strange for their novelty, and like to serve for occasions to report and means to remember his argument.

Certain sentences of his, somewhat obscure and as it were presuming upon his capabilities, will I fear make some of them rather admire than commend him. In sum, all is so well as words can make it, and if it please Her Majesty to add deeds, the Bacon may be too hard for the Cook."

Coke, who is thus referred to, was the other candidate for the vacant office of Attorney-General.

One may imagine that the Queen had at the back of her mind better things in store for Francis than making him her Attorney-General, but of course could not give her real reasons for thinking so. Eventually, after many weeks, the office was conferred upon Edward Coke. Essex was all for Francis having the office, for he knew how keenly Francis needed the emoluments. Returning from a Tower examination of one Ferrara, a Portuguese Catholic accused of a plot



against the Queen's life, Essex and Robert Cecil discussed the candidature, the appointments having not yet been made. Cecil suggested that if Francis would be contented with the office of Solicitor-General (which Coke, if promoted, would leave vacant) it might be easier digestion for the Queen. Essex replied: "Digest me no digestions the Attorneyship for Francis is that I must have, and in that I will spend all my power authority and might." However, as mentioned above, Coke obtained the appointment.

The rich physician to the Queen, Dr. Lopez, was found guilty on 28th February of being concerned in a plot to take the Queen's life. Francis was employed in the examination of some other conspirators concerned in the plot, and it is more than probable that he also was concerned in the examination of Lopez, as he made a written report to the Queen about it.

Not discouraged, he tried to obtain money upon another tack. He petitioned the Queen in his pen-name of *Lyly*, pointing out that after thirteen years' service he had lost his position of looking after the Revells. He asked her to give him some of the forfeitures, "that seeing nothing will come by the Revells I may pray upon the Rebels". The Queen, however, had not the mind to deprive the wife and children of Lopez of their rich inheritance. As a stop-gap, she gave Francis a commission which involved him in a journey to the North of England. We shall never know what substantial fee was to be paid, but Francis, took the risk of borrowing £60 from Anthony Bacon on 11th July upon the strength of it, and started his journey north.

According to *Have with you to Saffron Walden* (N) 1596, he journeyed as far as some town in Lincolnshire, probably Stamford, which is situated on the Great North Road, where, becoming ill, he decided to return to London, but had to lay up at Huntingdon for a day or two. From Huntingdon he wrote to the Queen regretting that illness prevented "my earning so gracious a vail as it pleased your Majesty to give me". The letter is dated 20th July; but on the 27th he took his M.A. degree at Cambridge at a special congregation, though without the usual exercises and ceremonies. Old friend Gabriel Harvey may have been present, as in *Have with you to Saffron Walden*, Francis made play about Harvey having occupied the next room to his at the Dolphin at Cambridge.

In August and September, Francis borrowed (altogether) £150 from Anthony, and appears to have rushed into print a good many old plays with the intent, as he put it in one of his letters, to "sing a requiem abroad." The plays included two chapel children comedies *Dido*, title-paged to the deceased Marlowe and Nash, and *Mother Bombie*, title-paged to John Lyly. There were also printed, anonymously, four plays for men-players—viz. *Spanish Tragedy*, *Taming of a Shrew*, *Selimus*, and *Henry VI*, (the Contention). Besides these were also some other plays printed. Title-paged to the deceased Greene:—*Friar Bacon Looking Glass for England*, and *Orlando Furioso*. Title-paged to the deceased Marlowe:—*Edward II*, and *Massacre at Paris*.

Possibly some of these plays did not appear until the first three

months of the following year, but all bear the 1594 date, and would seem to indicate that Francis was clearing out his manuscripts possibly with the purpose of leaving England. These plays had, of course, been written some years before. A narrative poem, *Lucrece*, with a printed dedication (as from William Shakespeare) to Earl Southampton, then a young rich nobleman at Gray's Inn, was also printed this year. *Venus and Adonis* had previously been dedicated to Southampton who was, of course, a fellow-resident of Bacon.

### "THE PRINCE OF PURPOOLE", 1594/5

Francis had a wonderfully merry, as well as an indomitable nature. In that latter quality, as perhaps in the former also, he strongly resembled the Queen.

For the Christmas Festivities at Greenwich Palace a stage had been erected by order of the Lord Chamberlain, upon which Burbage, Kemp, Shakspeare and their men-players from the "Curtain" theatre at Shoreditch performed two plays, one in the afternoon of 26th December, and the other in the afternoon of 28th December, their joint remuneration being £20. Francis for his part, seems to have prepared an elaborate device called the "Prince of Purpoole" (a rather significant title), for the Christmas "Revells" at Gray's Inn. Readers may question this statement, but if they will read the reprint of the masque in Nichol's *Progresses of Elizabeth*, and name any other humorist of the period jocular and clever enough to have penned its wonderful passages of sustained and rollicking merriment, the information will be worth having. Even Spedding regards Bacon's connection with this production as "sufficiently obvious". Associated with the device, a mock embassy of jovial barristers from the Temple was to have been received in state at Gray's Inn Hall in the evening of 28th December. Another attraction was a performance by the Shoreditch players at the Gray's Inn Hall at night of a play, presumably a repetition of the play acted that afternoon before the Queen. They were to proceed to the hall on horseback lighted by torches, and to act by torch-light. The show attracted more guests than the hall would accommodate. Consequently, when the Temple embassy arrived at Grays Inn there was no room for them, and the disappointed Temple barristers returned to their Inn. The guests who remained were set to dancing, and afterwards the players performed the *Comedy of Errors* on the stage in the hall which had been specially erected for the occasion.

But the lapse of hospitality against the Temple barristers had to be atoned for. Accordingly, a mock inquiry was held on 23rd January, 1594/5, concerning the tumult and its cause, and a certain 'sorcerer and conjuror' (these terms are used in the play of *Friar Bacon*, published earlier in 1594) was playfully accused of being the originator of the trouble, by "foisting a company of base and common fellows" upon the gentlemen of Gray's Inn. To avoid offence to the Queen, the "Prince of Purpoole" device was repeated before her at Shrovetide.

Before leaving the events of January, two letters which Francis

wrote that month should be noted. The first was to the Earl of Essex in which is the passage:

"Desiring your good lordship nevertheless not to conceive out of this my diligence in soliciting this matter, that I am much in appetite or much in hope. *For as for appetite the waters of Parnassus are not like the waters of the Spaw that give a stomach; but rather they quench appetite and desires.*"

Here we have just the attitude of a wearied literary man, who wanted pecuniary help, but was too absorbed in his work to worry continually after it. On the 25th January Francis wrote to Anthony Bacon a letter which indicates the difficulty the Queen was in. She seems to have been hoping for something more appropriate to turn up for Francis, and meantime delayed appointing a Solicitor-General. He quoted the Queen as saying:

"Why? I have made no Solicitor. Hath anybody carried a Solicitor with him in his pocket? But he (Francis) must have it in his own time *or else I must be thought to cast him away*".

"Then Her Majesty sweareth that if I continue this manner she will seek all England for a Solicitor rather than take me. Yea she will send to Houghton and Coventry next."

"Again she entereth into it that she never dealt so with any as with me, she hath used me in her greatest causes."

Then to Anthony:

"I pray you let me know what mine uncle Killigrew will do. For I must now be (more) careful of my credit than ever, since I receive so little thence where I deserved best. And to be plain with you I mean even to make the best of those small things I have, with as much expedition as may be without loss and to sing a requiem I hope abroad."

In this letter Francis stated that he had a number of men writing for him at Twickenham, and asked for a collection to be copied in succession to a collection about Irish affairs which his men had nearly finished.

The Queen got to hear that he intended to go abroad, and consequently he had to apologize to her in a letter to Cecil, in which he wrote: "Wheresoever God and Her Majesty shall appoint me to live, I shall truly pray for Her Majesty's preservation and felicity."

An interesting letter from Francis to Burleigh, dated 21st March 1594 or 1595, should perhaps be mentioned here. In this he wrote: "that howsoever this matter may go, yet I may enjoy your lordship's good favour and help, as I have done in regard to my private estate which, as I have not altogether neglected, so I have but negligently attended and which hath been bettered only by yourself (the Queen except) and not by any other in matters of importance. The last request I find it more necessary for me to make, because, (though I am glad of Her Majesty's Favour that I may with more ease practise the law, *which percase I may use now and then for my countenance*, yet to speak, though perhaps vainly, I do not think that the ordinary



practice of the law, not serving the Queen in place, will be admitted for a good account of *the poor talent which God hath given me.*" This rather goes to show that the Queen and Burleigh were his main-stays financially, and that the borrowings from his relations were temporary only, and that they were sooner or later repaid. In June, Fulke Greville repeated to the Queen that Francis had said that he (Francis) "*remained as a withered branch of her roots which she had cherished and made to flourish in her service.*" The innuendo of the words in italics is easy to see. (Compare the prophecy on the last page of the Shakespeare play *Cymbeline*.)

On 28th July, writing from Gray's Inn, Francis told Burleigh that if the Queen settled her choice for Solicitor-General upon an able man such as Sergeant Fleming, he would not seek to alter it. Fleming was appointed on 5th November. Francis wrote the device at tilt for the Queen's accession day, 17th November. It was known as Essex's device. The Crown renewal of the lease of Twickenham Lodge, this time to Francis for twenty-one years, is dated 17th November, and about the same date Essex procured for him Crown land at Twickenham valued at £1,800. Harmony having been restored, Francis summed up the situation in a letter to Essex from which the following passages may be quoted:

"For myself I have lost some opinion, some time and some means; this is my account: but then for opinion it is a blast that goeth and cometh: for time it is true it goeth and cometh not: but yet I have learned that it may be redeemed. For means, I value that most; and the rather because I am purposed not to follow the practice of the law: (If Her Majesty command me in any particular I shall be ready to do her willing service:) and my reason is only because it drinketh too much time which I have dedicated to better purposes."

Francis spent most of the year between Twickenham Lodge and Gray's Inn, and his output of literature remained fairly considerable. He seems to have published a number of old plays—*viz.*, *Old Wives Tale*, title-paged "G.P.," *Locrine*, title-paged "W.S.," *Cornelia* (a translation from the French of *Garnier*), title-paged to Kyd, one of his copyists, who had died in the previous year. The translation of the last named was done in a week.

A Roman play, *Wounds of Civil War*, founded (like the Shakespeare Roman plays) on Plutarch's *Lives*, was title-paged to Lodge (then just back from America), and two plays, *Henry VI* (true tragedy) and *Mucedorus*, were printed anonymously.

A novel, *Jack Wilton* (N), was published, dedicated to Earl Southampton, and a discussion on phantasms of the night, called *Terrors of the Night* (N), partly written in 1593, but finished in 1594 (and obviously) later than his visit to Huntingdon, since it adds an incident which occurred there, was also printed early in this year or after October in the year before. It was dedicated to Lady Elizabeth Carey, daughter of the Governor of the Isle of Wight.

(To be continued)

# FRANCIS BACON AS ESSAYIST AND ORATOR

by R. J. W. GENTRY

## PART II

CLOSELY akin to Bacon's style as an essayist is his style as an orator. As he was destined by birth and upbringing to enter the service of the state in the capacity of a diplomat and, possibly, a holder of high position, it goes without saying that his early training would have a bias towards developing in him the arts of address. His father, Sir Nicholas Bacon, had strong views about the training of youthful courtiers, and as he had advocated for these the practical study of diplomacy at foreign embassies, it was natural that he should send Francis, at the age of fifteen, to the French Court at Paris as an attache to the English Ambassador, Sir Amyas Paulet. The boy visited various places of interest and political importance, and his powers of observation and his discretion were exercised to the full. His mind must have eagerly registered a multitude of impressions, which would provide valuable material later for his own exercise of statecraft. Whilst in France he must have shown every sign of extraordinary ability, for the Ambassador saw fit to entrust him, as Dr. Rawley informs us, with "some message or advertisement to the Queen; which having performed with great approvation, he returned back into France again, with intention to continue for some years there." Paulet more than once commended the young Francis for his aptitude, in letters to Sir Nicholas.

But it was not to be that he should pursue the intricate paths of diplomacy. His father's death in 1579 brought Francis back to England and the necessity to make his own headway in life. The law became his special study, with a view to its leading him at length to service at court, and he was admitted an utter barrister in 1582. About two years after this he began his parliamentary career, as Member for Melcombe in Dorsetshire. In 1586 he became a Bencher of Gray's Inn. So, at the age of twenty-six, Bacon was set fairly in a course which demanded, among many other qualities, the gifts of an orator. His *Essay Of Discourse* shows he was conversant with the polite devices of conversation, and the stratagems of argument and persuasion.

Bacon's rhetorical sense is well evidenced by certain compositions which he wrote whilst a young man at Gray's Inn. It was customary for noblemen to entertain royalty with pageants or "devices" on special occasions, and in 1592 the rising Earl of Essex provided such an elaborate and costly show. Two interesting tracts entitled: *Mr. Bacon in Praise of Knowledge* and *Mr. Bacon in Praise of his Sovereign* (the manuscripts of which are yet preserved in the British Museum) are thought by Spedding to have been drawn up for this event. "My reason for suspecting that they were composed for some masque or show, or other fictitious occasion", he says, "is partly that the speech in praise of knowledge professes to have been spoken in a *Conference of Pleasure*, and the speech in praise of Elizabeth appears, by the opening

sentence, to have been preceded by three others, one of which *was* in praise of knowledge—partly that, earnest and full of matter as they both are (the one containing the germ of the first book of the *Novum Organum*, the other of the *Observations on a Libel*, which are nothing less than a substantial historical defence of the Queen's government), there is nevertheless in the *style* of both a certain affectation and rhetorical cadence, traceable in Bacon's other compositions of this kind, and agreeable to the taste of the time."

A reading of these two *Praises* and the *Observations*, and hearing them declaimed at the same time with one's inner ear, cannot fail to convey the pleasure of listening to a splendid orator. The writer of these superb examples of rhetoric must have well justified Ben Jonson's opinion of Bacon's quality as a talker: "His language (when he could spare a jest) was nobly censorious. No man ever spake more neatly, more pressly, more weightily; or suffered less emptiness, less idleness, in what he uttered. No member of his speech but consisted of his own graces. His hearers could not cough or look aside from him without loss. He commanded where he spoke and had his judges angry and pleased at his devotion. No man had their affections more in his power. The fear of every man that heard him was, lest he should make an end."

Even a short extract from the *Praise of Knowledge* shows something of his skill in the art of declamatory writing:

Are not the pleasures of the affections greater than the pleasures of the senses, and are not the pleasures of the intellect greater than the pleasures of the affections? Is not that only a true and natural pleasure whereof there is no satiety? Is not that knowledge alone that doth clear the mind of all perturbations? How many things be there which we imagine are not? How many things do we esteem and value more than they are? These vain imaginations, these ill-proportioned estimations, these be the clouds of error that turn into the storms of perturbations. Is there then any such happiness as for a man's mind to be raised above the confusion of things, where he may have a respect of the order of nature and the error of man? . . . Therefore no doubt the sovereignty of man lieth hid in knowledge wherein many things are reserved which kings with their treasures cannot buy, nor with their force command; their spies and intelligencers can give no news of them: their seamen and discoverers cannot sail where they grow. Now we govern nature in opinions, but are thrall to her in necessities. But if we could be led by her invention, we should command her in action. Pardon me, it was because almost all things may be indued and adorned with speeches, but knowledge itself is more beautiful than any apparel of words that can be put upon it."

On the anniversary of the Queen's accession, 17th November, 1595, the Earl of Essex exhibited another device before her Majesty, and some speeches were drawn up for him by Francis Bacon. Again, as models of oratory, these speeches—the Squire's, the Hermit's, the Soldier's, and the Statesman's—are of the best of their kind. There is the usual brilliant use of imagery, perfectly modulated tone, and a fine balance of thought and cadence. Each character unwinds his discourse



easily, effectively, and fully; each point is elaborated, but not laboured; and the full persuasive force of rhetoric—imagination seconding reason—is felt throughout. As an indication of the style of these pieces, the following short excerpts are given from the replies of the Hermit, Soldier, and Statesman to the address of the Squire.

*Hermit*: . . . Let thy master, Squire, offer his services to the *muses*. It is long since they received any into their court. They give alms continually at their gate, that many come to live upon; but few they have ever admitted into their palace. There shall he find secrets not dangerous to know; sides and parties not factious to hold; precepts and commandments not penal to disobey. The gardens of love, wherein he now placeth himself, are fresh today, and fading tomorrow, as the sun comforts them, or is turned from them. But the gardens of the *muses* keep the privilege of the golden age; they ever flourish, and are in league with time. The monuments of wit survive the monuments of power. The verses of a poet endure without a syllable lost, while states and empires pass many periods . . .

*Soldier*: . . . Squire, the good old man hath said well to you; but I dare say, thou wouldst be sorry to leave to carry thy master's shield, and to carry his books: and I am sure thy master had rather be a falcon, a bird of prey, than a singing bird in a cage. The *muses* are to serve martial men, to sing their famous actions; and not to be served by them . . . It is the war that giveth all spirits of valour, not only honour, but contentment. For mark, whether ever you did see a man grown to any honourable commandment in the wars, but whensoever he gave it over, he was ready to die with melancholy? Such a sweet felicity is that noble exercise, that he, that hath tasted it thoroughly, is distasted for all other. And no marvel; for if the hunter takes such solace in his chase; if the matches and wagers of sport pass away with such satisfaction and delight; if the looker-on be affected with pleasure in the representation of a feigned tragedy; think what contentment a man receiveth, when they, that are equal to him in nature, from the height of insolency and fury are brought to the condition of a chased prey; when a victory is obtained, whereof the victories of games are but counterfeits and shadows; and, when in a lively tragedy, a man's enemies are sacrificed before his eyes to his fortune . . .

*Statesman*: . . . My advice to thy master shall be as a token wrapped up in words: but then will it show itself fair when it is unfolded to his actions. To wish him to change from one humour to another, were but as if, for the cure of a man in pain, one should advise him to lie upon the other side, but not enable him to stand on his feet. If from a sanguine delightful humour of love, he turn to a melancholy retired humour of contemplation, or a turbulent boiling humour of the wars; what doth he change but tyrants? Contemplation is a dream; love, a trance; and the humour of war is raving. These be shifts of humour, but no reclaiming to reason . . . The merit of war is too outwardly glorious to be inwardly grateful: and it is the exile of his eyes, which looking with such affection upon the picture, cannot but with infinite contentment behold the life. But when his mistress shall perceive, that his endeavours are become a true support of her, a discharge of her care, a watchman of her person, a scholar of her wisdom, an instrument of her operation, and a conduit of her virtue; this, with his

diligences, accesses, humility, and patience, may move her to give him further degrees and approaches to her favour. So that I conclude, I have traced him the way to that, which hath been granted to some few, *amare et sapere*, to love and to be wise . . .

These instances of Bacon's remarkable word-sense and power of construction are perhaps enough to give us grounds for believing in Ben Jonson's remark about Bacon's commanding 'where he spoke,' and having his judges 'angry and pleased' at his will. There is no need to enlarge upon his forensic skill—we have the legal speeches surviving to impress us with his professional ability in stating a case. But the purport of this article is rather the rich panoply of words which he displays in his writings—his brilliant metaphors, his tremendous scope of imaginative thought, his graphic presentment of ideas, his concern with distinctions and shades of meaning.

Although Bacon was the champion of the direct study of nature, he was more eminently an expert in *human* nature; and his phenomenal mastery of the means of communicating his thought proclaims him one of the greatest literary artists in our language. The *Essays*, however, give only a partial view of his powers, some only of his numerous and varied styles. "But", writes S. H. Reynolds, "they have qualities of their own for which we shall find no exact counterpart elsewhere . . . It is not only that the matter of the *Essays* is often of the highest value; that they give us the experience of one who had looked on life from many sides, the compressed wisdom of an observer to whom the ways and thoughts of men had long been as an open book. Their perfection is rather in the combination of the matter and the form. The language in which they are written seems the proper clothing of the ideas. Even where the matter is valueless, there is consummate art in the garb of exalted wisdom which the author can fling about the most commonplace thoughts, yet without the least obvious unfitness between the language and the thought. His oracular manner; his sudden breaks, which leave the reader still eager and expectant; his crowded fulness of meaning; his wide range of thought; his seeming insight into the very centre of things; his unruffled calmness—there may be a trick in all this, but it is one which has not yet grown stale, and the secret of which the world has never yet found out . . . He is not a model for imitation, in language or in the structure of his sentences. He is a classic of a past age. He writes in a fashion which the modern world has long ceased to use, and it is impossible that it should ever return to it. But as a classic he will keep his place, and by universal agreement his place is in the first rank."<sup>1</sup>

Incidentally, Reynolds' view of Bacon's literary development does not accord with that of Arber put forward earlier. He says: "There are certainly marked differences of style in the three editions of the *Essays*. The first edition is compressed, bald, full of condensed thought, but utterly devoid of ornament. The edition of 1612 is occasionally

<sup>1</sup>*Bacon's Essays*.

ornate, its sentences run more smoothly and continuously; but force and precision are its main characteristics throughout. In the latest edition the ornate work becomes very much more frequent: there are long sustained passages of easy eloquence, and sentences here and there of singular and unaffected beauty, not thrust in, but flowing on continuously with the rest, and thus testifying to the all-round excellence of the work which suffers nothing by its neighbourhood to the very best. But it is not certain, even so, that Bacon's style had changed at either of the later years. He was employing a different style not because he had gained new powers, but because it pleased him then to use powers which he had previously suffered to lie dormant, as unfit for the special purpose which he had in view . . . The fact seems to be that Bacon had at all times almost any style at command, and that he varies his style with the occasion, becoming all things in turn so as to ensure getting a hearing, trying one experiment after another, and giving proof of mastery in each . . . To speak therefore of Bacon's style is in strict terms impossible."<sup>1</sup>

Another encomium comes from G. L. Craik: ". . . The writing is wonderful. What a spirit of life there is in every sentence! How admirably is the philosophy everywhere animated and irradiated by the wit; and how fine a balance and harmony is preserved between the wit and the sense . . . One new or uncommon thought is presented after another in more rapid succession than in almost any other book; and yet the mind of the reader is neither startled nor fatigued, so consummate is the rhetorical art."<sup>2</sup>

How true, incidentally, are all these remarks of that great luminary of another part of the literary firmament—William Shakespeare! And indeed it is a not uninteresting and unprofitable study to notice how frequently the thought of the Playwright is matched by that of the Essayist. To take merely a few examples: Cassius well knew, "If you would work any man, you must either know his nature, and fashions, and so lead him; or his ends, and so persuade him; or his weakness, and disadvantages, and so awe him; or those that have interest in him, and so govern him",<sup>3</sup> and he accordingly proceeded warily with the delicate business of inclining the sensitive, bookish Brutus to his dire plan. "It is one thing to understand Matters; for many are perfect in men's humours, that are not greatly capable of the real part of business."<sup>4</sup> Cassius had not the ability to raise himself to Caesar's level, but he did see quite through human nature. In his approach, he is as though instructed by Bacon: "It is better to sound a person with whom one deals afar off, then to fall upon the point at first, except you mean to surprise him by some short (*i.e.* direct) question."<sup>5</sup> And so he did.

---

<sup>1</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup>Bacon: *His Writings and His Philosophy*, Vol. I

<sup>3</sup>*Of Negotiating*

<sup>4</sup>*Of Cunning*

<sup>5</sup>*Of Negotiating*



To some extent, Timon was in accord with Bacon, who wrote, "Riches are for spending";<sup>1</sup> but the latter goes on immediately to add, "and spending for honour and good actions. Therefore, extraordinary expense must be limited by the worth of the occasion"; and here Timon defaulted, for *his* expense was about unworthy persons and matters. It was a pity he did not hearken to another piece of advice: "It is no baseness to descend and look into their own estate. Some forbear it, not upon negligence alone, but doubting to bring themselves into melancholy, in respect they shall find it broken."<sup>2</sup>

O my good lord

At many times I brought in my accounts,  
Laid them before you; you would throw them off  
And say you found them in mine honesty.  
When, for some trifling present, you have bid  
Return so much, I have shook my head and wept.<sup>3</sup>

Caius Marcius, could he have followed Bacon's advice, would have been wiser to avoid "extreme bitterness of words" and "breaking off business in anger". He would have realised that "contempt is that which putteth an edge upon anger, as much, or more, than the hurt itself".<sup>4</sup>

Had he been less obstinate and contemptuous towards the people, he might have followed the counsel of his mother, Volumnia:

I would dissemble with my nature where  
My fortunes and my friends at stake required  
I should do so in honour<sup>5</sup>

She would seem to have digested the *Essay Of Simulation and Dissimulation*, where it is written: "The best Composition, and Temper-ature is, to have Opennesse in Fame and Opinion; Secrecy in Habit; Dissimulation in seasonable use; And a Power to faigne, if there be no Remedy." Marcius was incapable of bridling his tongue. "I have noted," says Bacon, "that some witty and sharp speeches which have fallen from princes, have given fire to seditions . . . Surely, princes had need, in tender matters and ticklish times, to beware what they say; especially in those short speeches, which fly abroad like darts, and are thought to be shot out of their secret intentions."<sup>6</sup>

Macbeth might have benefited from the warning in *Of Wisdom for a Man's Self*: "Wisdom for a man's self is, in many branches thereof, a depraved thing . . . those which are *sui amantes sine rivuli* are many times unfortunate. And whereas they have all their time sacrificed to themselves, they become in the end sacrifices to the inconstancy of fortune, whose wings they thought, by their self-wisdom, to have pinioned."

We find Iago first setting the seed of suspicion in the third scene of Act III: "Did Michael Cassio, when you woo'd my lady, Know of your love?" From this beginning down to the point of his leaving, he

<sup>1</sup> & <sup>2</sup> *Of Expense*

<sup>3</sup> *Timon of Athens*, II, ii

<sup>4</sup> *Of Anger*

<sup>5</sup> *Coriolanus*, III, ii

<sup>6</sup> *Of Seditions*

proceeds in a manner fully in agreement with Bacon's observations upon the wiles of cunning men. His short replies, re-echoings of Othello's words, arouse a curiosity that grows rapidly in his hearer. The artful hesitancy in Iago draws fear in his victim. Othello says:

And,—for I know thou'rt full love and honesty,  
And weigh'st thy words before thou giv'st them breath,—  
Therefore these stops of thine fright me the more:  
For such things in a false disloyal knave  
Are tricks or custom . . .

In Bacon, we find: "The breaking off in the midst of that one was about to say, as if he took himself up, breeds a greater appetite in him with whom you confer, to know more."<sup>1</sup>

Precisely the fault that Bacon speaks of in his essay *Of Anger* was committed by Lear: "... Do not peremptorily break off in any business in a fit of anger: but howsoever you *shew* bitterness, do not *act* any thing that is not revocable." And another fault, committed by Anthony is covered in this passage of the essay *Of Love*: "They do best who, if they cannot but admit love, yet make it keep quarter, and sever it wholly from the serious affairs and actions of life; for if it check once with business, it troubleth men's fortunes, and maketh men that they can no ways be true to their own ends." The essays *Of Envy* and *Of Deformity* have much that applies directly to Richard III; Leontes might have found guidance by what is written in *Of Suspicion*; Angelo could have taken to heart these words from *Of Judicature*: "Judges must beware of hard constructions and strained inferences; for there is no worse torture than the torture of laws. Specially in case of laws penal, they ought to have care that that which was meant for terror be not turned into rigour; and that they bring not upon the people that shower whereof the Scripture speaketh: *pluet super eos laqueos*; for penal laws pressed are a shower of snares upon the people. Therefore, let penal laws, if they have been sleepers of long, or if they be grown unfit for the present time, be by wise judges confined in the execution." One may go on almost indefinitely showing to what a surprising degree Bacon and Shakespeare conformed in their views upon human nature.

And in regard to the kind of language used by both, it is interesting to have this testimony come to hand at the moment of writing: "By creating (this) style of courtly conversation Shakespeare made his contribution to the development of classical prose. Classical prose is in its very essence conversational; the fluent and witty conversation of high comedy is its masterpiece. But apart from its forced wit and poetic flavour, Shakespeare's conversational prose is distinguished from that of Restoration comedy by the staccato quality of its repartee. This has its exact parallel in the work of other contemporary forerunners of classical prose, for example, in Bacon's *Essays*."<sup>2</sup>

The evidence of Bacon's magnificent mastery of language, together with his wit and observation of men, is so fully demonstrated in the *Essays* and his surviving orations that we cannot but assent to Dr.

<sup>1</sup> *Of Cunning*

<sup>2</sup> *Shakespeare Survey* 8: Article by L. Borinski

Rawley's remark: "His meals were refectations of the ear as well as the stomach: like the *Noctes Atticae* or *Convivia Deipno Sophistarum*, wherein a man might be refreshed in his mind and understanding no less than in his body. And I have known some of no mean parts, that have professed to make use of their notebooks, when they have risen from his table. In which conversations and otherwise, he was no dashing man, as some men are; but ever a countenancer and fosterer of another man's parts. Neither was he one that would appropriate the speech wholly to himself or delight to out-vie others, but leave a liberty to the co-assessors to take their turns. Wherein he would draw a man on, and allure him to speak upon such a subject as wherein he was peculiarly skilful and would delight to speak: and for himself he contemned no man's observations, but would light his torch at every man's candle."

### PUBLICATIONS

*Exit Shakspeare*, and *Enter Francis Bacon* by Bertram G. Theobald.

The attention of members is especially drawn to these excellent little books, which many have found ideal as brief statements of the elements of the Baconian case and for passing on to potential new members! Priced at 5/8d. for the two these books are splendid value, and contain illustrations as follows:—

#### *Exit Shakspeare*

Supposed signatures of William Shakespeare.

Stratford Monument—Present day.

Stratford Monument—As illustrated by Dugdale 1656.

"Portrait" in Shakespeare Folio, 1623.

#### *Enter Francis Bacon*

Portrait of Francis Bacon by Passé.

Northumberland Manuscript—Facsimile of original folio I.

Northumberland Folio—in modern script.

Members should not be without these two volumes.



# SHAKE-SPEARE'S SONNETS AND "MR. W. H."

by

R. J. A. BUNNETT, F.S.A.

## II

Robert Southwell, the Jesuit missionary and writer, was born *circa* 1560. After being educated abroad, he was, in 1584, ordained priest, and nominated to the English Mission. Two years later, in company with Father Henry Garnett he arrived in this country, but his arrival was discovered by a spy of Walsingham, and his movements watched. Received into the home—probably Brooke House at Hackney—of Lord Vaux, who had himself been repeatedly prosecuted and fined, or imprisoned, as a recusant, and for long restricted as a suspected person within a certain distance from London—Southwell for six years wandered about under the name of Cotton, leading the life of a fugitive. Finally in 1592 he was arrested at Harrow, and for three years remained in prison, subjected to torture in the vain hope that he would betray his friends. On 21st February 1595 he was hanged at Tyburn. Lord Vaux died the same year.

It has been stated that the "Foure-fold Meditation" was not written by Southwell, but by Philip, Earl of Arundel<sup>1</sup> cousin of Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford.

In 1608 William Hall obtained for publication a theological MS., which appeared next year with his name on the title-page for the first time, evidence of independence, and which, socially, entitled him, to the prefix, 'Mr.'. Between 1609 and 1614 he printed some twenty volumes mostly sermons and works of a devotional nature, which included Guillim's noted "Display of Heraldrie" (1610). In 1612 Hall printed an account of the conviction and execution of a noted pick-pocket, John Selman, who had been arrested in the Royal Chapel, Whitehall, whilst practising his art. The book was described as printed by 'W. H.' and was on sale at the shop of Thomas Archer in St. Paul's Churchyard. After 1613 his business declined, and after disposing of it to a John Beale, William Hall disappeared into private life.

\* \* \* \*

Lee says "when Thorpe dubbed Mr. W. H., with characteristic magniloquence, 'the onlie begetter' (i.e. obtainer or procurer of these ensuing sonnets) he merely indicated that that personage was the first of the pirate-publisher fraternity to procure a manuscript of Shakespeare's sonnets and to recommend its surreptitious issue."

In this event the phrase cannot mean "sole inspirer" and the verb to 'beget' in the sense of 'to get', 'to acquire', does appear in Hamlet's instructions to the players.

---

<sup>1</sup> Article in "The Review of English Studies," April 1929 by H. J. L. Robbie.

"In the very torrent, tempest, and (as I may say) whirlwind of passion you must acquire and beget a temperance that may give it smoothness."

And Dekker wrote in 1602 in his 'Satiro-Mastix': "I have some cousins German at Court (that) shall beget you the reversion of the Master of the King's Revels." It was George Chalmers who in 1799 first broached the theory that 'begetter' only means 'procurer'.

J. T. Looney wrote: "Whether the letters W. H. are the transposed initials of Henry Wriothesley or not, there are no traces of 'our ever-living poet' attempting to give 'immortality' to any other contemporary; the man to whom the first of the Sonnets are addressed was certainly the begetter of the first section in the sense of being their theme and inspiration. It is natural to suppose, therefore, that the 'begetter' referred to in the dedication means the person to whom the particular sonnets are addressed. At the same time he was not the 'only begetter' in this sense, since others of these poems are just as certainly addressed to a dark lady."

Margaret M. Spain<sup>1</sup> declares: "The real 'begetter' of the sonnets was neither this gentleman—(the mysterious Mr. W. H.) nor yet the 'lovely boy' to whom his lover writes, "I grant thou wert not married to my Muse", but the Sonneteer himself, who evolved them through this same Muse or Spirit of Poetry." This writer, accepting the Baconian authorship of the Sonnets, takes the view that the poet was unwilling at first to give them publicity during his life time, and that some literary friends succeeding in overcoming his hesitancy, undertook the business of publication.

So Mr. W. H. begot the sonnets in a secondary sense when he gave them to the world in printed form.

\* \* \* \*

Now the 'Oxfordians' in expressing their conviction that Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford was the author of the Sonnets, suggest that in the general clearing up of the Oxford family affairs in 1609, including the sale of King's Place, Hackney, the MS. of the poems was found. Also that William Hall obtained both the MS. of the "Fourefold Meditation" and of the Sonnets on this occasion.

Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, was born in 1550, and was only twelve years old when his father died. He was made a royal ward, and was placed in the charge of Sir William Cecil, afterwards Lord Burghley. Among his tutors was his uncle Arthur Golding<sup>2</sup>. A month after his father's death, the boy went from the hereditary Hedingham Castle, Essex, to reside with the Cecils at Westminster. At fourteen and a half he received an Hon. M.A. degree at St. John's College, Cambridge. Of pronounced literary tastes, we find him in 1567 admitted to Gray's Inn with Philip Sidney and John Manners, brother of the Earl of Rutland. Oxford became a supporter of the Earl of Sussex at Court in his feuds with the Earl of Leicester. He was

<sup>1</sup> "Who Wrote Shakespeare's Sonnets?", 1946.

<sup>2</sup> Arthur Golding (1535-1605?). Translator of theological works by Calvin Beza and others, but chiefly noted for his versions of Caesar's 'Commentaries' (1565) and of Ovid's 'Metamorphoses' (1565-7), the latter in ballad metre.

high in favour with the Queen who attended his wedding in Westminster Abbey in 1571 when he was twenty-one, to Anne Cecil, Burghley's daughter. After being refused active service against Spain in the Low Countries, Oxford devoted himself to literature. As he was forbidden to travel, there was consternation at Court when it was found that he and Lord Seymour had gone to Brussels, but after being recalled urgently by the angry queen, he was restored to favour, and in 1575 was granted permission to travel. Starting for Paris, the young Earl toured Italy and visited Sicily. He possessed a company of players, the 'Oxford Boys', which toured the provinces, and acted in London at the Curtain Theatre.

On reaching Paris in 1576, Oxford heard of the rumour in Court circles that his daughter, Elizabeth, born in July, was not his child—the story it seems, was the outcome of some intrigue. A reconciliation was effected, and two more daughters and a son were subsequently born. In 1577 the Queen bestowed upon the Earl land worth £250 a year "for good and faithful service" of an unspecified nature. Two years later occurred the famous tennis court quarrel with Sir Philip Sidney, the pair at the time being literary rivals, Oxford being the leader of the Euphuists, with Lyly<sup>1</sup> and Munday<sup>2</sup> in support; Sidney, assisted by Spenser and Harvey<sup>3</sup> leading the Romanticists.

Various works were dedicated to Oxford, and in 1578 we find Gabriel Harvey urging him to give up literature and devote himself to a life of action. The same year Francis Meres wrote: "The best for Comedy among us be Edward Earl of Oxford."

After his return from the Continent, de Vere, with several of his friends, became reconciled to the Church of Rome; but, realizing that this involved allegiance to Spain, he divulged to her Majesty certain facts, which resulted in Lord Henry Howard, Charles Arundel, and Francis Southwell being sent to the Tower, together with, for a short time, Oxford himself. Through the mediation of Burghley the last-named was restored to favour, but in 1581 he was involved in a scandal with Anne Vavasour, one of the Maids of Honour to the Queen and was for a time again imprisoned in the Tower. This episode caused a duel between Sir Thomas Knyvet, the lady's uncle, and the Earl, in which both were wounded, the latter seriously. Oxford equipped at his own expense a vessel, "The Edward Bonaventure" and was engaged in the attack on the Armada. At the Thanksgiving Service for the victory held in St. Paul's, he, as Lord Great Chamberlain and senior Earl, helped to carry the golden canopy over the Queen.

\* \* \* \*

It is somewhat difficult to regard the opening line of Sonnet CXXV, "Were't aught to me I bore the canopy" as having the least reference to this occasion, for it is quite possible that 'bearing the canopy' is to be understood in a figurative sense. Samuel Butler, however, was convinced that this Sonnet relates to the event in question

<sup>1</sup>*Lyly, John* (1554?-1606) Dramatist and miscellaneous writer.

<sup>2</sup>*Munday, Anthony* (1553-1633) Dramatist, poet, and pamphleteer.

<sup>3</sup>*Harvey, Gabriel* (1545?-1630) Poet—the Hobbino! of "The Shephard's Calendar".



and that as Stow<sup>1</sup> in his "Annals of England" states that her Majesty going in procession had "her footmen and pensioners about her," Shakespeare presumably being one of the former, would be holding on by tassels to the canopy's fringe! Butler dates the Sonnet to this time. A further conjecture is that this Sonnet relates to a procession organised for the reception of the Spanish Ambassadors in 1603. A note in the Knowle archives records that the canopy on this occasion, was to be carried by "the King's Company of Players." Mr. W. H. being furious at the choice of Shakespeare for this duty, was clearly a most disagreeable and conceited young man. Hence there was a row, and an apology!

\* \* \* \*

On 6th June, 1588, the Countess of Oxford died; but her husband does not appear to have been present at her funeral, nor to have had any part in the erection, by Lord Burghley in Westminster Abbey, of the Memorial to her and her mother, who died in the following year. It seems clear that there was some estrangement between the pair.

Thereafter for sixteen years, Oxford's life is something of a mystery. He withdrew from Court, and at some unknown date married Elizabeth Trentham, daughter of Thomas Trentham of Rocester in Staffordshire (whom it has been sought to identify with the T.T. of the Dedication) and one of Elizabeth's Maids of Honour. Their son, Henry, afterwards the 18th Earl of Oxford, was born in 1593. In 1601 the Earl officiated as one of the judges at the trial of Essex.

1596 found the Earl and Countess occupying King's Place, Hackney, together with Lady Vaux, this property having been conveyed to the Countess.

Oxford died in 1604 and his remains were buried in St. Augustine's Church, Hackney. Five years after her husband's death, Lady Oxford sold King's Place, with some 270 acres of land, to Fulke Greville, afterwards Lord Brooke<sup>2</sup> and at the same time purchased Castle Hedingham, which had been previously sold by the Earl.

The Countess died in 1612, and was buried beside her husband in Hackney Church, which was pulled down in 1798. So far as is known no tomb was ever erected over them, and no will of the Countess has ever been discovered.

(to be continued.)

---

<sup>1</sup>Stow, John (1525-1615). Historian and antiquary.

<sup>2</sup>Brooke, Fulke Greville, Lord, (1554-1628). Poet and statesman. Buried in Warwick Church. The inscription on his tomb runs, "Fulke Greville, servant to Queen Elizabeth, counsellor to King James, friend to Sir Philip Sidney."

## GEORGE SANDYS

BY EDWARD D. JOHNSON

I have recently obtained a book entitled "A Relation of a Journey begun An. Dom. 1610. Four books containing a description of the Turkish Empire of Aegypt, of the Holy Land, of the Remote parts of Italy and Islands adjoining." London printed for W. Barrett 1615.

No author's name is given on the title page, but it contains a Preface addressed to The Prince and signed George Sandys.

This is a folio volume containing 309 pages, an engraved title page and also a large map. In the book itself there are forty-eight beautiful engravings, but it must have been very expensive to produce, and the sale of it would not have raised sufficient money to pay for its production.

Both Bacon and the author of the Shakespeare Plays must have read George Sandys' *Journey*, because they both quote from this book—"Shakespeare" in his plays, and Bacon in his *Sylva Sylvarum*. Here are a few examples:

- Bacon: "The Water of Nilus is sweeter than other waters in taste."  
Sandys. "Than the waters whereof there is none so sweet."  
Sandys. "They put the water in large jars of stone, stirring it about with a few stamped almonds."  
Bacon. "It is certain that in Egypt they prepare and clarify the water of the Nile by putting it in great jars of stone and stirring it about with a few stamped almonds."  
Bacon. "Upon that very day when the river first riseth great plagues in Cairo used suddenly to break up."  
Sandys. "The Plague, which here oft miserably rageth, upon the first of the flood doth instantly cease."  
"Shakespeare": "They take the flow o' the Nile By certain scales i' the Pyramid."  
Sandys. "By the pillar, standing in a vault within the castle, entered by the Nile they measure his increase."  
"Shakespeare": "The higher Nilus swells, the more it promises."  
Sandys. "Answerable to the increase of the river, is the plenty or scarcity of the year succeeding."

The above two quotations from Shakespeare are from *Anthony*

and *Cleopatra*, Act 2, Scene 7.

Sandys' *Journey* was not published until a few months before Will Shakespere died, so Will Shakespere had no opportunity to read this book and take extracts to insert in the play of *Anthony and Cleopatra*. And that play was not published until seven years after Will Shakespere had died.

George Sandys was an active member of the Virginia Company of which Francis Bacon was the chief founder and it would also appear that Francis Bacon assisted Sandys in publishing this book. Bacon was in the habit of earmarking all books when he was concerned in the publication, and in this instance twenty-seven lines of the address to the Prince appear to contain his signature, inlaid in the same manner as in Don Adriana's Letter.

### THE PRINTER OF SHAKE-SPEARE'S SONNETS

According to McKerrow's *Dictionary of Printers*, which covers Shakespeare's period and beyond, George Eld was the son of John Elde of Scampton, Derbyshire. He was apprenticed to the printer, Robert Bolton, for eight years from Christmas 1592, and was given the freedom of the Printers' Company in January 1599 (old style). He married the widow of Richard Read (printer) and she had been previously married to the printer Gabriel Simson. Eld took over several blocks, and the type, from the printing shops of his wife's two previous husbands.

He printed all sorts of books, e.g. Stow's *Annales*, Camden's *Remains*, Bolton's *Elements of Armorie*, sermons, travels, plays, histories. Apart from the Shake-speare Sonnets in 1609, he printed the first edition of *Troilus and Cressida* in the same year. In 1607 he printed the Shakespeare apocrypha play, *The Puritaine Widdow*. Thomas Thorpe who published the Sonnets, also gave to Eld the printing of Marston's *What You Will* in 1607. How interesting it would be to know how, or where, Thorpe obtained the manuscript or manuscripts of the Sonnets! Another famous play which he printed was the 1608 edition of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*.

It is curious that some of the title-pages of the Sonnets give William Aspley as the bookseller, and some name John Wright. This does not mean that there were two distinct printings. There was no disturbances of the type except for the change of names of the book-sellers after some of the copies had been printed. Eld and Aspley were often combined in printing and publishing.

Eld died of plague in 1624, and was succeeded by Miles Fletcher.

R. L. EAGLE.



## CORRESPONDENCE

To The EDITOR OF *BACONIANA*,

Dear Sir,

### THE MISSING MSS.

Your correspondent D. W. Price, writes that "once the Plays and other works were in print there was no need for their preservation." and he infers that they were then destroyed. But, Francis Bacon, in his cypher writings, tells us of his provision for their safe keeping until a "time far off", and this is explained in Mrs. Gallup's "Bi-literal Cipher of Francis Bacon," Part III, 1910, in the chapter on "The Lost Manuscripts."

On p.2 of the letter we read:—

"Our task is often shared—by one most devoted always, the constant and faithful friend William Rawley. He it is which must fulfil our plan of placing certain MSS....To insure their preservation in tombs, graves, or in monuments,...it is our design to put MSS. (of plays, poems, histories, prose, etc.) in a marble monument and in tombs wherein the cinders of our masques may lie".

And on p.3.

"There cannot be found a better device than that of the stone of the Stratford Tablet...to preserve a large part of the plays...A box shall thereby appear after much quest. Thence the plays mayst thou take, if the century shall be passed."

The cipher text in "De Augmentis", 1623 states that the MSS. of the plays were placed in the Shakespeare tomb, but, later decipherings explain a change of plan, and their being placed elsewhere. The "Apophthegms," 1625, cipher, after various references to the MSS. and markings of those of Greene, Peele, Marlowe and Spenser, reads:—

"No box is in so odd a place as that having the MSS. that added so much to the name of Will S., supposed in his time to write...The place now is Canonbury."

In the "De Augmentis" cipher Rawley voices his own criticism against putting the MSS. in tombs and monuments, which he foresees tumbling 'into ruins'.

But apart from the cipher writings, there is evidence of the MSS. being in the monument at Stratford-on-Avon church. In Sir William Dugdale's "Antiquities of Warwickshire," 1656, is an illustration of this monument as he then saw it. In the inscription are the words—"death hath plac't *Willm. this monument* Shakspeare," and following the inscription is Dugdale's note,

"(Near the wall where this monument is erected lyeth a plain free stone underneath which his body is buried with this Epitaph)—

Good frend for Jesus sake for beare

To digg the dvst enclosed heare!

Blese be <sup>e</sup> man <sup>t</sup> spares thes stones,

and curst be he <sup>t</sup> moves my bones.

So although the *body* was in the floor of the chancel, "*Shakespeare*" was "within" this monument in the walls, where, obviously, there was no sufficient depth for a body. The only explanation of this seems to be that "*Shakespeare*" was, indeed, within the wall, but in the form of the MSS.

Yours faithfully,

T. WRIGHT

To the Editor of THE DAILY TELEGRAPH  
Sir,

### WHAT SHAKESPEARE LOOKED LIKE

Mr. R. Dumont-Smith is not correct in saying that the *present* monument in the Stratford Parish Church is the one made by Gerard Johnson a few years after his death. The original monument and bust was erected to the memory of Will Shaksper, the retired actor and tradesman, of Stratford, and depicted a thin, hard-faced man with a drooping moustache and a ragged beard, with both hands resting on a bag or sack tied with rope at the four corners. In 1748 "the original monument and bust through length of years and other accidents having become much impaired and decayed" (The Rev. J. Greene, Master of Stratford Grammar School, 1746), it was taken down, and in its place was erected the faked monument and bust as it is seen to-day. Will Shaksper, the retired actor and tradesman, has been turned into William Shakespeare, the playwright, and in place of the bag shown in the original monument he has been given a cushion and his right hand now holds a pen, the left hand resting on a sheet of paper. In place of the original bust of the business man with his drooping moustache and ragged beard we now see a stout-faced man with a smirking doll-like face, an upturned moustache and neatly-timmed beard, holding a pen and a sheet of paper, and which does not resemble the original bust in any way whatsoever.

If your readers will look at the bust as it is to-day you will see an upturned moustache with a space between the moustache and the base of nose and a similar space between the moustache and the upper lip of the mouth; in fact the moustache looks as if it were a false one gummed on. Now we all know that if a man does not shave, the hair of the moustache begins to grow at the base of the nose and continues down to the upper lip of the mouth. A search of the Prints Department of The British Museum has failed to disclose any print or engraving of any Englishman alive in 1616 when Shaksper died wearing a moustache similar to that shown in the present Stratford Bust, and it is not until we come to *the days of Charles II* that we can find an illustration of a moustache similar to that shown in the Bust, and this style of moustache was of *foreign* origin and was adopted by Charles II courtiers. If Shaksper ever wore such a moustache, it is very strange that it appears in the Stratford Bust *only* and *no where else*, and that there is not a single portrait of Shaksper in existence depicting him wearing such a moustache. This proves conclusively that the present Bust is different from that which was originally placed on the Stratford monument and that it is of a later date, namely 1748 or 1749, when the original monument was discarded and the new monument put up.

Yours faithfully,

EDWARD D. JOHNSON.

**Editor's Note.**—Owing to pressure on available space, the above letter which adduces interesting additional data on the Stratford Parish Church Shakespeare busts, was not included in the last *Baconiana*. Unfortunately, it did not appear in the *Daily Telegraph*.

To the Editor of BACONIANA  
Dear Sir,

In aphorism 123 of book one of *Novum Organum*, quoted in the editorial of *Baconiana*, No. 155, Bacon describes his work for humanity as a pledge in wine as distinct from that of other writers in science who pledge in water. Elsewhere he alludes to wine with reference to poetry and passion. Thus in the *Essays* he writes, "One of the Fathers, in great severity, called Poesy *vinum dæmonium*; because it filleth the Imagination, and yet is but with the shadow of a Lie." (*Of Truth*).

Again in the *Advancement*,

"One of the Fathers, in great severity, called poetry the devil's wine, as indeed it begets many temptations, desires, and vain opinions." (Book 3, chapter 7).

and,

"Of all things known to mortals, wine is the most powerful and effectual



for exciting and inflaming passions of all kinds, being indeed, like a common fuel to them all." (Book 2, Chapter 13).

In aphorism 123, Bacon may be reminding us that his greatest gift to humanity does not consist of a system of philosophy such as the *Novum Organum*, which is indeed a mere pledge in water, but in poetry. By means of the latter, as for instance in the plays of Shakespeare, the dry bones of philosophy are clothed with living flesh, so that we have perfect poetic images of life itself which teach and at the same time delight succeeding generations of mankind. By means of this poetic wine a noble passion for truth, goodness, and beauty is kindled in the receptive mind. Such poetry does not intoxicate the mind with vain opinions because it has been,

"Strained from countless grapes, ripe and well-seasoned and collected in clusters, squeezed in the press and clarified in the vat."

That is, such poetry really focusses or concentrates the accumulated wisdom of generations of recorded human experience.

Yours faithfully,

H. N. THOMAS.

## WHY BACON USED PSEUDONYMS FOR HIS PLAYWRITING

The modern critic quite forgets, the art of the playwright was considered a *despised weed*, in Bacon's age, as is testified by abundance of evidence . . . Selden declared "It would be impossible for a lord to write verses," and for a man in Bacon's position, whose legal career depended upon solid character and rational learning, to have figured as a play writer, would have exposed him to the mercy of his enemies and ruined him in Elizabeth's eyes, to say nothing that the writing of such treasonable plays as *Henry IV* would have taken him to the Tower, as it did, indeed, Hayward for the same thing. Everlastingly critics cry out "Why did not Bacon acknowledge his writings?" If he had it is certain he would never have died Viscount St. Albans, or been Lord Keeper! The critic thinks of the modern standing of the actor, he sees the stage ennobled to an art, the theatre a splendid structure of imagination, the drama now on a level with all that is best in literature and acknowledged (as a profession) in society,—but he does not see the *Globe*, or the *Fortune*, the *Rose*, or the *Curtain*, as they once stood, mere cockpits full of gods and apple-gnawing rabble, seated on rude benches, and the structures themselves (like the *Globe*) mere mountebank edifices as they are represented in engravings and woodcuts handed down to us! Poetry and playwriting in the service of the court, as the composition of masques and barriers, might raise a man like Ben Jonson, who had been a bricklayer, or even a reputed Shakespeare, but it would degrade a nephew of Lord Burleigh, a son of Queen Elizabeth's Lord Keeper, an aspirant at court and on the bench,—a man whose mother, Lady Anne Bacon, held every eccentricity in abhorrence, with the severity of a straight-laced rigid Puritan. Even Bacon's splendid talents and prose writings raised the voices of his enemies against him. Coke, his great rival and life-long foe, declared the *Advancement of Learning* a work none but a fool would have written, and said Bacon's ship device deserved to be freighted with fools . . .

*The Columbus of Literature* by W. F. C. Wigston, pp. 216/7.